DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 523 RC 007 230

AUTHOR	Gerlach, Ernest
TITLE	The Employment of American Indians in New Mexico and Arizona. Staff Report #3.
INSTITUTION	Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Nov 72
NOTE	94p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*American Indians; Comparative Analysis; Employers; *Employment Patterns; *Labor Force; *Occupational Surveys; *Reservations (Indian); Tables (Data); Unemployment
IDENTIFIERS	Arizona; New Mexico

ABSTRACT

The document describes the employment patterns of reservation and nonreservation American Indians in New Mexico and Arizona. Topics cover (1) reservation characteristics; (2) 5 selected reservations; (3) Federal government employment; (4) state and local government employment; (5) public school employment; and (6) private employment. Discussion topics are further detailed in the tables at the end of the document. (FF)

ED 081523

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE EMPLOYMENT OF AMERICAN INDIANS

IN NEW MEXICO AND ARIZONA

STAFF REPORT # 3
ALBUQUERQUE/PHOENIX HEARINGS

U. S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
NOVEMBER 1972

007230

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

RESERVATION CHARACTERISTICS.....2

FIVE SELECT RESERVATIONS 5

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT 16

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS 18

OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES 25

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT 30

PUBLIC SCHOOL EMPLOYMENT 33

PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT 35

TABLES 38

FOOTNOTES.....87

INTRODUCTION

American Indians live in a state of economic underdevelopment and deprivation. More than any other minority group they suffer from high unemployment rates and low wages. Indians often lack basic work experience and vocational skills. On many reservations nearly 50 percent of the labor force is unemployed.

Indians living on reservations in Arizona and New Mexico are often isolated from the growth and prosperity of the majority society. The social and economic isolation experienced by other minority groups is compounded for Indians by the geographical isolation of reservations. As a result, residents of reservations usually have little interaction with the majority population. Even on reservations, Indians are isolated. The sparse populations, the large land areas, and the poor transportation and communication facilities all contribute to the social, economic and physical isolation of Indians.

An analysis of Indian employment patterns both on and off reservations requires recognition that there is a difficulty in calculating Indian unemployment rates. A large proportion of Indians are not counted in the labor force. While the average participation rate for the total labor force in the United States in 1969 was approximately 60 percent, the corresponding rate for most reservations in the Southwest was about 40 percent. One reason for the low participation of Indians

in the labor force is that many Indians do not actively seek employment because of ill health or physical handicap, family responsibility, lack of training and experience, or cultural conflict.[1/]

The lack of English proficiency is another hindrance. For example, in a recent survey on the Navajo Reservation only 56.5 percent of the men and 43.8 percent of the women had some spoken and written proficiency with the English language.[2/] Lower educational attainment levels compared to the other population groups in New Mexico and Arizona, as well as limitations in speaking English, place Indians in an unfavorable position in competing for jobs on and off the reservation.[3/]

Most of the Indian labor force in New Mexico and Arizona is relatively young, poorly educated, and largely unskilled. A majority of the Indian labor force is employed on reservations. Usually this employment is of a sheltered type. That is, Indians are usually extended preference when reservations jobs are available. Despite this sheltered employment situation, considerable unemployment and underemployment exists on most of the reservations in New Mexico and Arizona.

RESERVATION LABOR FORCE CHARACTERISTICS

The Bureau of Indian Affairs estimates that in 1972 about 28,876 Indians in New Mexico, and 38,407 Indians in Arizona, 16 years and over, were in the labor force.[4/] Of this total, 11,047 or 38 percent of the

Indian labor force in New Mexico was unemployed, and 5,229 were identified as being underemployed. Of the Indians in the labor force in Arizona, 15,520 or 40 percent were classified as being unemployed. In contrast, the unemployment rate for all other population groups in 1972 was reported to be 5.4 percent in New Mexico and 4.1 percent in Arizona.

The estimated total Indian labor force for the BIA Albuquerque Area in 1972 was 11,987. Of this total about 3,391 Indians or 28 percent were unemployed. In the Navajo Area, 43,793 Indians were in the labor force, 19,219 or 44 percent were classified as unemployed. For the Phoenix Area, it was estimated that about 15,800 Indians were in the labor force. About 5,726 or 36 percent were identified as unemployed. 5/

Not only do Indians in Arizona and New Mexico have high unemployment rates, a significant number were reported to have only temporary employment. For example, the BIA estimated that 20 percent of the Indian labor force in Arizona was employed in a temporary or periodic basis. In New Mexico about 18 percent of the Indian labor force had only temporary employment. 6/ These statistics indicate that seasonal or irregular work characterizes a significant part of employment available to reservation Indians.

Of 43 reservations in Arizona and New Mexico, only five reservations (the Ak-Chin, Fort McDowell, and Salt River Reservations in Arizona and the San Felipe and Santa Ana Reservations in New Mexico) reported an unemployment rate under ten percent. The unemployment rate for reservation Indians in 1972 ranged from a low of 2 percent on the Fort McDowell Reservation in Arizona to high of 89 percent on the Alamo Reservation in New Mexico.[7/]

In addition to temporary and seasonal employment, many Indians are employed in service related occupations.[8/] A large number of reservation Indians in Arizona and New Mexico are engaged in governmental and related work. This employment is provided mainly by the Federal Government; the Bureau of Indian Affairs employed 1,633 Indians in New Mexico, and 1,717 Indians in Arizona. In addition, some state and local governmental units maintained operations on reservations, providing some jobs for Indians.

In 1969, the Indian Manpower Resources Study reviewed employment on five reservations in New Mexico and Arizona: Fort Apache, San Carlos, Papago, Acoma and Laguna. On the five reservations, 442 Indians (43 percent), of the 1,031 interviewed, indicated that they were employed in the governmental sector. Twelve of these indicated that they were employed by State agencies; 78 claimed that they were employed by the tribal government, and 352 indicated that they were employed by the Federal Government.[9/] On some reservations the largest

government employer is the tribe itself. For example, on the Navajo Reservation the tribe employs about 5,450 persons, nearly 45 percent of all those employed on the reservation. More significantly, 65.8 percent of all the wage and salary workers on the reservation are employed by the tribal government.[10/]

Employment in the other sectors, such as agriculture, construction, manufacturing, transportation, communications, wholesale and retail trade, is usually limited. However, on some reservations, especially on the Navajo and Fort Apache Reservations in Arizona and the Laguna Reservation in New Mexico, employment in manufacturing, is significant, although small in relation to the reservation population.

Many reservation Indians are self-employed, usually in traditional occupations such as rugweaving, silversmithing, and sheepherding. No accurate statistics are available which would indicate the magnitude of this type of employment; however, the Navajo Manpower Survey did indicate that about 15 percent of those employed on the Navajo Reservation were employed in "traditional agricultural" categories, and about 16 percent were employed in "traditional nonagricultural" activities.

EMPLOYMENT PROFILE OF SELECTED RESERVATIONS IN NEW MEXICO AND ARIZONA

In this section, analysis will be presented on the manpower resources of five reservations in Arizona and New Mexico--The Fort Apache, San

Carlos and Papago Reservations in Arizona and the Acoma and Laguna Reservations in New Mexico. The data is derived from a survey conducted by Arizona State University and the Arizona State Employment Service in 1969, which was called the Indian Manpower Resources Study (IMRS).[12/]

The Papago Reservation is the largest in geographic size and total population. Next in size and population are Fort Apache Tribe (population about 6,500) and San Carlos Reservation (population about 4,722).

The New Mexico tribes included in this study are somewhat smaller in geographic size and population. The Acoma Reservation had a population of 1,944 and the Laguna had 2,464 Indians. The two reservations are connected geographically, and their cultures are similar.

On the basis of 1,029 responses, the IMRS found that the most important employment for Indians on these five reservations was government. Over half (54.4 percent) of the Indians surveyed on the San Carlos Reservation indicated that they were employed in government jobs. On the Papago, Acoma, and Laguna Reservations over 30 percent of the Indians indicated that they had been or were employed in government related activities. (Table 1)

The Federal Government was the most important source of employment, providing about 80 percent of all government jobs. State government was relatively unimportant, but local government provided most of the remaining government jobs. Local government jobs were often provided by the tribe itself.

Services are second to government as a source of employment. Approximately 23 percent of all the respondents on the Papago Reservation indicated that they were employed in services. Nearly 15 percent of the respondents on the Fort Apache Reservation, and 12 percent on the San Carlos Reservation were employed in service related occupations.

Approximately 30 percent of all employment on the Papago Reservation was related to agricultural and forestry categories. Lumbering was especially important on the Fort Apache and San Carlos Reservations. Mining, on the other hand, was relatively unimportant on the reservations in Arizona. However, on the Acoma and Laguna Reservations in New Mexico, mining was a major source of employment. According to the IMRS study 16 percent of the Indians on the Acoma Reservation and 13 percent on the Laguna were employed in this catergory.

The contract construction and transportation industries provided very few of the jobs on the reservations surveyed. None of the reservations in the study had a significant number of Indians employed in related activities such as communications, electric and gas services.

Manufacturing as a source of employment on the reservation was important on only two reservations--The Fort Apache and the Laguna. Twenty percent of all the respondents on the Fort Apache Reservation were employed in manufacturing. On the Laguna Reservation, 19 percent indicated employment in that sector.

Prior to the IMRS survey, less than 50 percent of the respondents were employed. (Table A)

Table A

Major Activity Most Of the Year Prior to Indian Manpower Resources Survey

Activity	Fort Apache	San Carlos	Acoma	Laguna	Papago
Working	44.1%	37.5%	40.8%	44.8%	26.7%
With a job but not at work	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.4	0.5
Looking for work	3.4	2.3	0.4	2.7	3.7
Keeping house	19.2	28.4	29.2	25.3	30.2
Going to school	12.3	16.6	16.3	11.9	11.4
Unable to work	18.4	9.5	7.1	8.1	11.6
Retired	0.9	2.9	2.1	4.6	7.1
Other	1.5	1.4	4.2	2.3	8.7
Number in survey	533	349	240	261	378

SOURCE: Indian Manpower Resources In the Southwest: A Pilot Study

The labor force participation rates on the five reservations indicated that Indians in almost every age group participated at a lower rate than the U.S. rate. On all the reservations, the 16 to 19 year old age group was characterized by the lowest labor force participation rates relative to the U.S. rate. The participation rate for the next two age groups 20 to 29, and 30 to 39 are the highest of any age groups. However, the consecutive age groups following the 30 to 39 age group exhibit decreasing labor force participation in contrast to the pattern for the Unites States, as a whole, which has increasing labor force participation throughout the 16 to 59 age range. (See Table B)

Table B

Civilian Labor Force Participation Rates by Reservation Compared with United States Rates

Total (Percentage by Age Group)

Age Group	Fort Apache	San Carlos	Acoma	Laguna	Papago	U.S.
16-19	25.0%	12.2%	9.4%	22.7%	7.9%	44.2%
20-29	59.4	43.3	42.9	51.8	48.4	67.0
30-39	57.5	65.9	53.2	72.2	45.2	70.3
40-49	52.1	44.4	57.2	54.5	28.3	73.4
50-59	45.5	37.2	46.2	60.7	25.0	74.2
60 and over	26.9	11.5	29.8	16.1	27.5	29.5
All groups	47.3	39.1	40.0	47.3	30.3	59.4

SOURCE: Indian Manpower Resources In the Southwest: A Pilot Study

Indians on four of these reservations begin dropping out of the labor force in their late thirties. The one exception is the Acoma Reservation. The labor force participation rate for each age group up to the 40-49 age range increases and then decreases somewhat in the 50-59 age group. The total United States rates are characterized by increasing participation up to the sixties. There is a particularly large difference between the Papago labor force participation rates for people in their forties and fifties and the U. S. rates for these age groups.

Participation rates among Indian females were lower than comparable U. S. rates, but the pattern by age groups was similar. The greatest difference between the female rates on these reservations and the female rates for comparable United States rates is found in the 16 to 19 age group and the 40 to 49 age group. On the Acoma Reservation

Table C

Female Civilian Labor Force Participation Rates: By Reservation Compared with Total United States Rates (Percent by Age Group)

Age Group	Fort Apache	San Carlos	Acoma	Laguna	Papago	U.S.
16-19	15.9%	13.0%	0.0%	30.8%	6.6%	37.4%
20-29	42.5	27.8	22.2	45.2	38.7	49.2
30-39	27.3	38.6	23.1	44.4	24.5	45.2
40-49	20.6	17.7	26.7	37.0	10.8	52.2
50-59	37.5	21.7	28.0	37.5	7.0	55.9
60 and over	2.3	4.0	9.1	38.5	26.7	17.8
All age groups	25.6	22.7	18.8	33.6	18.6	41.5

SOURCE: Indian Manpower Resources In the Southwest: A Pilot Study

a zero participation rate for females should be noted. For all reservations, Indian labor force participation rates for older women are lower than the comparable rates for the U. S. (See Table C)

The participation rate for all age groups is usually lower for reservations than for the United States. Labor force participation rates are highest for all men in the U. S. in the 30 to 49 year old age group. Rates for both younger and older Indian male age groups are generally lower than the U. S. rate. While participation rates for the U. S. as a whole tend to increase as the age group grows older, the pattern for the five reservations is relatively stable. (See Table D)

Table D

Male Civilian Labor Force Participation Rates: By Reservation And United States

Age Group	Fort Apache	San Carlos	Acoma	Laguna	Papago	U.S.
16-19	37.5%	11.5%	21.4%	11.1%	8.7%	51.4%
20-29	75.3	61.3	68.2	60.0	58.1	88.0
30-39	86.2	95.1	90.5	100.0	77.1	97.8
40-49	79.5	90.0	100.0	82.4	56.5	96.3
50-59	50.0	55.0	78.6	91.7	41.9	92.3
60 and over	52.6	18.5	48.0	26.7	28.0	44.2
All age groups	68.2	57.6	66.4	63.3	42.5	79.7

SOURCE: Indian Manpower Resources In the Southwest: A Pilot Study

Since many Indians did not ever consider themselves in the labor force, the IMRS surveyed the reasons for this phenomena. The most frequently mentioned reason was related to family responsibilities. Of those not seeking work on the San Carlos and Acoma Reservations, 48 percent listed family responsibilities as a reason for not seeking work. This response is related to a lack of desire to leave the reservation to work. (Table E)

Another important reason for not seeking work was related to health and physical handicaps. Over 25 percent of the respondents on the Fort Apache, San Carlos, and Laguna Reservations listed this reason.

A significant number of respondents indicated a lack of necessary schooling, training or experience as a reason for not seeking work. Over 15 percent of the Indians interviewed on the Fort Apache, San Carlos and Laguna Reservations indicated this as their primary reason for not working.

Table E

Reasons Given For Not Seeking Employment: By Reservation

	PERCENT OF THOSE NOT IN LABOR FORCE				
Reason	Fort Apache	San Carlos	Acoma	Laguna	Papago
Believes no work is available	15.2%	2.6%	1.7%	10.6%	4.0%
Couldn't find work	10.0	2.7	0.0	4.5	7.0
Lacks necessary schooling, training	16.1	15.4	2.5	17.7	10.5
Employers think they are young or too old	15.2	1.7	2.5	14.2	15.4
Personal handicap	7.1	12.8	0.8	5.3	5.3
Can't arrange for child care	13.7	8.7	1.7	10.6	8.3
Family responsibilities	19.0	47.7	47.5	37.5	37.7
In school or other training	9.5	12.8	19.2	14.3	9.6
Ill health or physical handicap	25.6	27.5	15.0	25.0	19.7
Other	13.7	8.7	12.5	12.5	13.6
Don't know	13.7	2.0	3.3	12.7	4.0
Number in sample	211	149	120	113	228

SOURCE: Indian Manpower Resources In the Southwest: A Pilot Study

People may withdraw from the labor market because they feel that the chances of finding a job are very small. On the Fort Apache Reservation, over 15 percent of the respondents believed that no work was available. On the Laguna Reservation, almost 11 percent felt that work was not available. These figures are considerably higher than those for the other three reservations.

On all five reservations, over 30 percent of those who were not employed during the year prior to the survey had never been employed. The rates for the Fort Apache and San Carlos Reservations were especially high. A large number of respondents also indicated that they had not worked for five or more years. Seventy-Five point nine percent of the people surveyed on the Fort Apache Reservation,

Table F

Time of Last Employment of Those Not In Labor Force: By Reservation

	PERCENT RESPONDING				
Time	Fort Apache	San Carlos	Acoma	Laguna	Papago
Within past 12 months	7.1%	2.9%	2.5%	13.6%	4.8%
1-2 years ago	8.5	4.1	1.7	7.3	4.8
2-3 years ago	4.5	2.9	4.2	3.6	3.4
3-4 years ago	2.2	2.3	0.9	1.8	3.9
4-5 years ago	1.8	0.6	4.2	0.9	6.1
5 or more years	11.6	11.7	27.1	39.1	30.4
Never worked	64.3	75.4	59.3	33.6	46.5
Total	100.0	99.9	99.9	99.9	99.9
Number	224	171	118	110	230

SOURCE: Indian Manpower Resources In the Southwest: A Pilot Study

and 86.4 of those surveyed on the Acoma Reservation had never worked or had not worked for five or more years. The rates for the other reservations were 87.1 percent for the San Carlos Reservation, 72.7 percent for the Laguna Reservation, and 76.9 percent for the Papago Reservation. A large proportion of the Indian populations on these reservations had been isolated from the labor market over a long period of time. (Table F)

Employment on these reservations was not likely to be year-round. Only 44.1 percent of all those interviewed who were employed on the Fort Apache Reservation indicated that they worked year-round. The rates for the other reservations

Table G
Usual Type of Employment: By Reservation

Type of Employment	Fort Apache	San Carlos	Acoma	Laguna	Papago
	PERCENT OF WORKERS				
Year-round	44.2%	52.1%	61.6%	71.5%	46.3%
Seasonal	28.9	27.8	25.0	11.0	33.6
Irregular	26.9	20.1	13.4	16.8	20.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.3	100.1
Number	301	169	112	136	134

SOURCE: Indian Manpower Resources In the Southwest: A Pilot Study

were higher, but the incidence of seasonal and irregular employment was also higher. For example, on the Papago Reservation, 53.8 percent of the respondents indicated that they were employed in seasonal or irregular work. On the Acoma Reservation 38.4 percent were employed less than 12 months a year. (Table G)

When Indians were employed on the reservations, they generally worked 35 hours per week or more. Only fifteen percent or less of those employed, worked less than 40 hours. Over 50 percent on each reservation worked the standard 40 hours per week. Approximately 20 percent on each reservation worked more than the normal 40 hours. On some reservations over 5 percent revealed that their jobs required 60 or more hours per week. (Table H)

Table H

Hours Per Week Usually Worked by Employed: By Reservation

Hours	Fort Apache	San Carlos	Acoma	Laguna	Papago
1-14	3.3%	5.3%	3.5%	10.9%	5.8%
15-29	1.9	5.3	3.5	3.6	6.6
30-34	5.3	5.3	4.4	1.5	3.7
35-39	5.0	7.6	4.4	0.7	3.7
40	65.8	67.3	65.8	73.2	51.1
41-48	12.0	5.3	14.0	4.4	8.7
49-59	2.0	2.3	3.5	2.2	10.9
60 or more	4.7	1.8	0.9	3.6	9.5
Total	100.0	100.2	100.0	100.1	100.0
Number	301	171	---	138	137

SOURCE: Indian Manpower Resources In the Southwest: A Pilot Study

A large number of employed Indians indicated that their primary source of job training was on-the-job training. Over 50 percent of the respondents noted that they learned their jobs after they were employed. Government training programs and formal schooling accounted for most of the skill training prior to employment. On the San Carlos Reservation, 19.8 percent of those interviewed indicated that their primary source of training was from OEO and BIA sponsored manpower training programs. Only on the Laguna Reservation was military training significant source of job training. On the other reservations, training derived from the armed forces was minimal. A significant number of those interviewed by IMRS, indicated that self-taught skills and instruction from friends and relatives were important sources of initial training.

IMRS also found that unions had little or no impact on the five reservations. This finding is not surprising considering the isolation of the reservations and the heavy concentration of employment in government work. In addition, little employment is available near these reservations where Indians might encounter unions.

In conclusion, considerable unemployment and underemployment existed on the five reservations. To a large extent, seasonal or irregular work characterized the employment situation. What stability existed in employment, apparently came only from government or service related jobs.

FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT OF INDIANS IN NEW MEXICO AND ARIZONA

Overview

American Indians are well represented in Federal employment in Arizona and New Mexico. In 1971, Indians were in 13.8 percent of all Federal jobs in New Mexico and 15.0 percent of all Federal jobs in Arizona.[13/] However, a large percentage of these Indian employees were concentrated in the lower grade and wage board levels. For example, while Indians made up 17.9 percent of all the Federal employees in the General Schedule (GS) pay system in Arizona, 54.8 percent of these employees were in grades GS-1 through 8. In New Mexico, American Indians were 14.5 percent of all the employees in the GS pay system, yet 49.3 percent were concentrated in GS-1 through 8.[14/] (Tables 2 and 3)

Similarly, Indians comprised 20.0 percent of all the wage board workers in Arizona; but 40.7 percent of all the Indian regular nonsupervisory employees, 68.0 percent of the Indian regular wage employees, and 19.0 percent of all the Indian regular supervisory employees were concentrated in wage levels 1 through 3. Over 50 percent of all Indians in other wage systems were making below $6,999 annually. In New Mexico, Indians constituted 17.5 percent of all the wage board employees, but almost 36 percent of all the Indian employees in the nonsupervisory category, 25.6 percent of the Indian regular wage employees, 4.5 percent of the regular supervisors, were in grades 1 through 3. Over 27 percent of all the

Indian employees in other wage systems were making less than $6,999 a year. 15/

From 1967 to 1971 Indian employment in the Federal Government in New Mexico and Arizona increased. In 1967, 10.8 percent of all Federal employees in New Mexico were classified as American Indians. They held 26.6 percent of all the classified jobs at grades GS-1 through 4, but only 4.1 percent in grades GS-9 through 11, and 2.6 percent in grades GS-12 to 18. At the same time, they constituted 15.7 percent of all the wage board workers in the State, but made up 29.5 percent of all the blue-collar workers earning less than $5,499 annually; and, only 5.4 percent of those making $8,000 or more.

By 1971, 13.8 percent of all Federal employees in New Mexico were identified as American Indians. They held 36.0 percent of all the GS-1 through 4 positions, and 5.6 percent of the classified jobs in grades GS-9 through 11, an increase of 1.5 percent of 1967. At the same time, Indians held 3.7 percent of all the GS jobs in grades 12 to 18, an increase of 1.1 percent. In the wage board category, Indians comprised 17.5 percent of all the wage board employees, an overall increase of 1.8 percent.

In Arizona, a similar pattern occurred. In 1967, Indians comprised 14.5 percent of all the Federal employees in the State; compared with 15.0 percent of the total Federal employment in 1971. However, the number of Indians concentrated in lower grades seemed to increase. For example, in 1967, 34.7 percent of all the Indians in the GS pay system were in grades GS-1 through 4. In 1971, 42.2

percent were in grades GS-1 through 4; the number of Indian employees in classified jobs at grades GS-9 through 11 increased to 5.9 percent in 1971 -- an overall increase of 1.5 percent. The number of American Indians in grades GS-12 through 18 declined slightly from 5.7 percent in 1967 to 4.4 percent in 1971. In the wage board category, Indians constituted 20.0 percent of all the wage board employees in 1971, a slight decrease from 1967.

Indian Employment in the Bureau of Indian Affairs

The largest Federal employer of Indians in the region is the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In 1971, the BIA employed a total of 2.829 employees in the GS pay system and 1,112 in the wage board system in Arizona. Of this total, Indians constituted about 60.6 percent of all GS employees, and 85.6 percent of all wage board employees. In New Mexico, a total of 2,854 GS employees and 699 wage board employees were employed by the BIA. Indians were 56.2 percent of all the GS employees, and 86.9 percent of all the wage board employees.

Although Indians comprised the majority of all GS and wage board employees hired by the BIA, most of these Indian employees were concentrated in the lower grade and wage board categories. For example, in Arizona, Indians comprised 81.2 percent of all the GS personnel employed in Grades 1 through 5, while white personnel constituted only 7.3 percent of all the GS employees in these grade levels. On the other hand, Indians were only 23.6 percent of all

classified employees in grades GS-11 through 15, while whites constituted slightly over 70 percent of all employees in these grades. (Table 4)

The same grade distribution appeared to be true for Indian employees in New Mexico. Indians constituted 89.5 percent of all classified employees in grades GS-1 through 5; while whites were only 7 percent of all employees in these grades. Conversely, Indians comprised only 17.2 percent of all classified GS employees in grades GS-11 to 15, while whites constituted 74.5 percent of all employees in these grades. (Table 5)

In Arizona, almost 80 percent of all the Indians employed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the GS pay system were employed in grades 1 through 5. In New Mexico, approximately 75 percent of all the Indians employed by the BIA in the GS pay system were concentrated at or below the GS-5 grade level. On the other hand, only 11.3 percent of all white employees in Arizona, and 9.5 percent of all the white GS employees in New Mexico were employed in these grades.

In Arizona, slightly over 85 percent of all wage board workers employed by the BIA in 1971 were classified as American Indian and only 12.5 percent were identified as white. Approximately 60 percent of all the Indian wage board employees earned less than $9.000 a year. At the same time, only 9.3 percent of the white blue collar workers made less than $9,000 annually. (Table 6) Conversely, over 90 percent of all the white wage board employees earned more than $9,000 annually; whereas, only 39.1 percent of all the Indian wage board workers made more than $9,000 a year.

In New Mexico, American Indians made up 85.5 percent of all the wage board workers employed by the BIA. However, over 70 percent of these Indian wage board employees earned less than $9,000 annually. At the same time, approximately 85 percent of all the white wage board workers employed by the BIA earned more than $9.000 a year. (Table 7)

Figures from BIA Administrative Areas show similar grade and wage level distribution among BIA employees in 1972. For example, the BIA employed 931 GS employees in the Albuquerque Area. Indians were 57.5 percent of this group. Approximately 69 percent of all Indians employed by the Albuquerque Area Office in the GS pay system were concentrated at or below grade level 5; whereas, only 9.6 percent of all the non-Indian GS employees were located in these grades. On the other hand, slightly over 50 percent of all non-Indian GS employees were located in grades GS-11 through 15, while only 8 percent of all Indian GS employees were in these grades. (Table 8)

The Navajo Area Office employed a total of 3,796 GS employees. Of this total, 2,293 were Indian, and 1,503 were classified as non-Indian. Indians constituted approximately 60 percent of all the GS employment in this area office; however, 82.5 percent of these Indian employees were located in grades GS-1 through 5. Only 13.5 percent of all the non-Indian employees were in these grades. About 22 percent of the non-Indians were employed in grades

GS-11 through 15; only 4.3 percent of the Indian employees were in these grades. Most of the Indian employees were concentrated in the GS-3,4 and 5 grades; whereas, most of the non-Indian employees were employed as GS-9's. (Table 9)

The same grade level distribution exists for the Phoenix Area Office. One thousand two hundred and eighteen GS employees were employed by the Phoenix Area Office. About 50.6 percent of these were Indians. Approximately 70 percent of the Indian employees were in grades GS-1 through 5; whereas, only 16 percent of all non-Indian GS employees were in these grades. Over 40 percent of all non-Indian GS employees were in grades GS-11 through 15. On the other hand, only about 10 percent of the Indian employees were in these grades. The majority of all Indian employees were in grades GS-3, 4 and 5; whereas, most of the non-Indians were concentrated in grades GS-9 and 11. (Table 10)

In wage board jobs in these Area Offices, over 50 percent of the Indian employees earned less than $9,000 a year. In the Phoenix Area Office, 332 Indians and 127 non-Indians were employed as wage board workers. Over 51 percent of all Indian wage board employees earned less than $8,999 annually; whereas, only 13.3 percent of the non-Indian employees made less than this wage. On the other hand, over 86 percent of all the non-Indian wage board employees earned more than $9,000 a year, and only 52.1 percent of the Indian wage board employees made more than $9,000 annually. (Table 11).

In the Navajo Area, a total of 1,376 wage board workers were employed by the BIA. Of this total, 1,177 were classified as Indian, and only 199 were identified as non-Indian. However, 67 percent of these Indian wage board workers earned less than $9,000 a year; whereas, only 16 percent of the non-Indian wage board workers made less than $9,000 annually.

The same wage level distribution appeared for the Albuquerque Area. In 1972, 170 Indians and only 19 non-Indians were employed as wage board workers. Over 71 percent of the Indian employees made less than $9,000 a year; while only 37 percent of the non-Indian wage board employees earned less than this wage.

These statistics indicate that while Indians constitute a majority of all the GS and wage board employees in the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Arizona and New Mexico, they are disproportionately concentrated in the lower grade and wage board levels.

Indian Preference and the Bureau of Indian Affairs

Indian preference applies specifically to the employment of American Indians in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and the Indian Health Service (IHS). According to Congressional mandate

> An Indian has preference by law on initial appointment (in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and in the Indian Health Service) provided the candidate has established proof that he is one-fourth or more Indian and meets the minimum qualifications for the position to be filled. 16/

In other words, any Indian applicant for a position in the BIA or IHS, provided that he is one-fourth or more Indian, and has the

basic qualifications for the position for which he has applied, has preference over any non-Indian applicant.[17] This preference applies not only to initial employment, but also to re-employment, reductions-in-force, and promotions. The Bureau of Indian Affairs did not interpret Indian Preference to cover "promotions" until June 23, 1972.

The Indian Health Service, which operates under the same preference law,[18] had previously extended Indian preference to cover promotions and other personnel matters. In accordance with this interpretation, the IHS issued a policy statement dated May 26, 1970 which stated:

> It is... the policy of the Indian Health Service to extend administratively the principle of Indian preference to promotion and career development. Therefore, where preference will be extended to Indians in the area of service placements, training, career development and promotions, whenever possible, within the precepts of good management.[19]

At this time, Indian preference is limited to the BIA and the IHS. No more than one-half of one percent of all Federal positions are subject to Indian preference.

The original purpose of this preference clause was to assist Indians toward self-government by providing the education, training, and opportunity necessary to insure an adequate and

acceptable life. Implicit in the self-government concept was that Indians should help make policy decisions within the Bureau. It was originally thought by some that Indian preference would be all inclusive, eventually leading to the creation of an all Indian Bureau of Indian Affairs.

At present, about 46 percent of the positions in the BIA (nationally and locally) are filled by non-Indians, principally in the higher GS levels. It has been alleged that the BIA has created a system which prevents Indians from advancing to higher levels in the Bureau. In an article entitled "No Room at the Top", it was concluded that the BIA has, in effect, discriminated against its own Indian employees in employment, promotions and training, even though it has a clear legislative mandate, dating from the 1880's, requiring that Indians be given absolute employment preference within the Bureau. At the present time, because of various and often conflicting interpretations of Indian preference, and to some extent because of Civil Service rules and regulations it is alleged that qualified Indians have found it difficult to advance within the Bureau. 21/

The statistics on New Mexico and Arizona, presented above, point out that while many Indians are employed by the BIA, they are concentrated in the lower grade and wage board

levels. It should also be emphasized that Indian preference is a policy applicable only to the BIA and the IHS.

Indian Employment in Other Federal Agencies in New Mexico and Arizona

The purpose of this section is to briefly analyze the employment patterns of a number of Federal agencies having staff in Arizona and New Mexico and to determine the over-all distribution of American Indian employees in these agencies as of November 1971.[22/]

Department of Health, Education and Welfare (DHEW)

This agency employed a total of 2,284 employees in Arizona, a majority of whom were in the Indian Health Service. The number of American Indian working for DHEW in the State totaled 995. Seven hundred and seventy-four Indians were employed in the GS category and 221 were employed in various other wage systems.

In New Mexico, DHEW employed a total of 1,457 persons. Of these, 768 were American Indians. Five hundred and thirty-two were GS employees, 169 were wage board workers, and 67 were employed in other pay systems.

Although DHEW employed many American Indians in both states, a large majority of these employees were concentrated in the lower grade and wage levels. For example, in New Mexico,

American Indians comprised 81.8 percent of all the GS employees in grades GS-1 through 4, 44.6 percent of all the employees in the GS-5 through 8 grades, 17.5 percent of all the employees in the GS-9 through 11 grades, and only 16.3 percent of all the employees in the GS-12 through 18 grades.

In Arizona, a similar pattern emerged. About 80 percent of all the employees in the GS-1 through 4 grades were American Indians, and only 13.4 percent of all the GS employees in grades 9 through 11 were Indians.

In wage board positions, most of the Indian employees were in the lower wage levels. For example, in Arizona 81.1 percent of all the employees in the WG-1 through 3 wage grade were Indian; whereas, only 2.8 percent of all the white employees were in these wage levels. At the same time, 91.9 percent of all the blue collar employees in the WG-4 through 6 wage levels were Indians. In New Mexico, Indians constituted 88.8 percent of all the regular nonsupervisory employees. However, 9[illegible] percent of all the employees in the WG-1 through 3 wage levels were Indians, and only 1.4 percent of all the white employees were in these wage categories.

Department of the Interior

The Department of the Interior employed a total of 5,018 persons in New Mexico, and 5,692 persons in Arizona. Indians constituted 47.4 percent of the jobs in New Mexico, and 51.6 percent of the jobs in Arizona.

While Indians represented a relatively large part of the total employment in this department in both states, most of the Indians were in the lower grade and wage levels. For example, in New Mexico 79.6 percent of all the GS employees in the GS-1 through 4 category were identified as Indians; while only 10.1 percent of all the white employees were in these grades. A similar situation existed in Arizona where 86.4 percent of all the employees in the GS-1 through 4 grades were Indians, and only 11.9 percent were classified as white.

In the wage system there is a more even distribution of personnel. While Indians were 84 percent of all the employees in the WG-1 through 3 wage categories in New Mexico, they also made up 41.1 percent of all the employees in the WG-10 through 12 category. In Arizona Indians experienced a similar distribution in the wage board system.

Post Office Department

The employment of American Indians in the Post Office in both states was minimal. For example, in New Mexico, only 34 Indians were employed by the Post Office out of a total employment of 2,578. In Arizona the same number of Indians were employed out of a total work force of 5,093. Most of these Indian employees were concentrated in the PFS-1 through 5 grades, which includes 4th class postmasters and rural carriers.

Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

In 1971, HUD employed a total of 77 employees in New Mexico, and

136 employees in Arizona. In New Mexico only 4 Indians were employed by this agency in the GS pay system. In Arizona only one Indian out of a total staff of 136 was employed by HUD.

Department of Agriculture

Although the Department of Agriculture employed a substantial number of people in both states, American Indians were only a small part of the total employment. In New Mexico, out of a total employment of 1,363, only 27 employees were identified as American Indian. Of this total, 26 were employed in the GS pay systsm, but 15 of these were in the GS-1 through 4 grade levels. In Arizona, Indians were only 4.8 percent of a total work force of 1,439. Of the 69 Indian employees employed by tnis department, 59 were classified as GS employees. However, 51 of the Indian GS employees were in GS-1 through 4 grade levels.

Department of the Army

The Army employed a total of 4,498 civilian employees in Arizona and 5.154 civilians in New Mexico. However, Indians constituted only 15 percent of all the civilian employees in New Meixco and Arizona. Twenty-eight Indians were employed by the Army in New Mexico, and 24 were employed in Arizona.

Department of the Air Force

The Air Force has a total civilian employment of 4,100 in New Mexico, and 4.410 in Arizona. Only 17 Indians were employed by the Air Force in New Mexico, and 21 were employed in Arizona. American Indians comprised less than one percent of the total

civilian employment in the Air Force in both states.

To summarize, with the exception of the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the number of Indians employed by Federal agencies in both states was minimal. Those Indians that were employed in these agencies were usually concentrated in the low grade and wage levels.

EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS IN STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

New Mexico

In 1971 New Mexico State agencies employed only 198 Indians out of a total state employment of 10,557. Only 20 State agencies out of a total of 73 employed any Indians.[23/] The majority of Indians were employed in three agencies -- the Employment Security Commission, the Department of Health and Social Services, and the Highway Department.

The median salary range for all State employees was between $240 and $660 per month. (Table 12) The median monthly salary for Indian employees was between $400 and $499 per month. For whites, the median monthly salary was between $500 and $599 per month. Only 6.6 percent of all Indians employed by the State were receiving between $600 and $699 per month, while 17.8 percent of the whites, 10.1 percent of the Spanish Surnamed, and 12.6 percent of the black employees were in this pay range. (Table 13)

Forty-seven and eight tenths percent of all State employees were above the median salary range. Over 66 percent of the white State employees received a salary that was above the median. Only 32 percent of the Indian employees, 34.9 percent of the Spanish Surnamed, and 27.9 percent of the black employees were above the median. (Table 14)

The median educational level for all State employees was 12 years. Eighty-nine and one tenths percent of all State employees had at least a 9th grade education. Over 94 percent of the white employees

had at least a 9th grade education, while only 81.3 percent of all Indian employees achieved this level. In fact, Indians had a lower educational attainment level than any of the other groups. This disparity becomes more apparent at the 12th grade level. Slightly more than 78 percent of all of all State employees achieved a 12th grade education, yet only 69 percent of all Indian employees had a high school education.

Over 85 percent of all Indian employees lived in four counties -- Bernalillo (40), McKinley (55), San Juan (38), and Santa Fe (37). In Bernalillo County, Indians occupied only 40 positions out of a total of 1,666 State jobs. In McKinley County, while Indians comprised about 54 percent of the population, they held only 41 percent of all the State jobs. In summary, while Indians made up 7.2 percent of the State's population, they comprised only 1.9 percent of the total State employment in New Mexico. (Table 16)

Arizona

According to the Arizona Civil Rights Commission, American Indians constituted only 1.6 percent of the total State employment in 1971. Indian employment decreased from 358 or 1.7 percent of the State employment in 1969, to 306, or 1.5 percent of the total in 1970. In 1971, Indian employment in Arizona State agencies increased to 418, or 1.6 percent of the total. (Table 17)

Approximately 84 percent of all Indians employed by the State government were concentrated in seven agencies: Arizona State University, the State Education Department, Employment Security Commission, Highway Department, Northern Arizona University, University of Arizona, and the Welfare Department. (Table 18) Of the 418 Indians employed by the various State agencies, 264 or 63.1 percent were located in white collar, or skilled jobs; while 154 were employed in low skill occupations. However, Indians made up only 1.2 percent of all employees in the white collar jobs, although they comprised 2.8 percent of all the state employees in the OG-2 or blue collar classifications.

To summarize, both Arizona and New Mexico State agencies employed few Indians. Those Indians that were employed by the States were generally in low-skill occupations. Even on a percentage basis, Indians were a small part of the total employment. In New Mexico, Indians were 7.2 percent of the State's population, yet only occupied 1.9 percent of the State jobs. In Arizona, Indians were 5.4 percent of the total population, yet occupied only 1.6 percent of the State jobs.

Local Government Employment In Arizona

The employment of Indians in local and municipal governments in Arizona appears to be minimal. In Phoenix, only 49 Indians were employed in 1971 out of a total municipal employment of 5,020. Indians were less than one percent of the total municipal employment in 1971. (Table 19)

In Phoenix, about 65 percent of all Indians employed by the city were in the Water and Sewers Department. More than half were classified as semi-skilled operatives, 2 were classified as unskilled laborers, and five were identified as skilled laborers. The vast majority of Indians employed by the city were classified as semi-skilled or unskilled. (Table 20)

In Tucson, Indians are a small part of the total municipal employment, less than one percent. (Table 21)

Indian Employment in Public Schools in Arizona and New Mexico

Indians represent a small proportion of the total employment in school districts throughout Arizona and New Mexico.

In 1972 the Arizona Department of Education reported that out of a total public school enrollment of 468,927 pupils, 4.85 percent or 22,754 were American Indians. Of the 37,722 certified and non-certified school employees reported in various categories, only 791 or 2.10 percent were Indians. American Indians were 3.8 percent of 634 of all the non-certified employees in various categories; and, 0.77 percent of 157 of those employed in the certified category.[25/] (Table 22)

Eighty-four percent of all the non-certified Indian school employees were employed in four job categories -- transportation, cafeteria work, custodian services, and teacher aides. More important, Indians constituted only 0.48 percent of all the certified teachers, and 1.47 percent of all the guidance counselors. The majority of Indian school employees were located in four

counties -- Apache, Coconino, Gila and Navajo. Even in these counties Indian employees were only a small proportion of all school employees. Over 70 percent of the population in Apache County was Indian, yet Indians were only 28 percent of the total school employment in that county. In Navajo County, Indians were 48 percent of the population, yet they were only 14.6 percent of all the school employees. In Coconino County, almost 25 percent of the population was Indian; only 14 percent of all the school employees in that county were Indians. In Gila County, Indians were 8.3 percent of all the school employees in the county, yet they were over 15 percent of the county's population. (Table 23)

In Apache County, 67.1 percent of all the pupils enrolled in public schools were Indian, yet only 15 Indian teachers out of a total of 313 were employed by the various schools. Navajo County had 2,798 Indian pupils attending public schools, yet only 7 teachers out of 422 were Indians. About 23 percent of the total school enrollment in Coconino County were Indians, yet only 2.3 percent of the teachers were Indian. In Gila County, almost 15 percent of the student enrollment in the public schools were Indians, but less than one percent of all the teachers were Indians. (Table 24)

Apparently, a similar situation exists in New Mexico. In 1968, there were approximately 16,965[26/] Indian pupils enrolled

in 14 school districts in Bernalillo, McKinley, Rio Arriba, Sandoval, San Juan and Valencia Counties. Indian pupils comprised about 28 percent of the school enrollment in these districts.[27/] However, only 1.6 percent of all the teachers employed in these school districts were Indian. (Table 25)

None of the districts had more than 10 percent of its teaching staff as Indians. Even in those school districts having a substantial Indian enrollment, the number of full time Indian teachers was low. For example, during the 1968-69 school year, over 75 percent of the pupil enrollment in the Central Consolidated School District located in San Juan County were Indians, yet only 9.6 percent of the teachers were Indians. In the Gallup School District located in McKinley County, Indian pupils were over 50 percent of the total enrollment; yet, only 5.1 percent of the teachers were Indians. In the Bernalillo School District located in Sandoval County, 47.5 percent of the total school enrollment were Indians, yet only 2.6 percent of the teachers employed by this district were Indians.

To summarize, Indians were only a very small part of all the school employees, in both Arizona and New Mexico. More significant, however is that Indians comprised an extremely small percentage of the teachers and counselors.

PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS

According to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in 1970, approximately 2,968 Indians out of a total surveyed labor

force of 77,335 were employed in 466 separate business units in New Mexico. Indians were 3.8 percent of the State's labor force.[28] In Arizona, 3,152 Indians out of a surveyed labor force of 196,899 were employed in 982 business units. Indians comprised 1.6 percent of the State's labor force.[29]

A large proportion of the surveyed Indian labor force was employed in occupations of low economic s tatus. For example, of the 2,968 Indian employees in New Mexico, 1,523 were employed as operatives, 246 were employed as unskilled laborers, and 222 were employed in various service occupations.(Table 26) In Arizona, the number of Indians employed in low status jobs was 2,262 or approximately 72 percent of all Indians employed in private business. (Table 27)

In a special survey of Indian Employment in Phoenix, Arizona[30] and Albuquerque, New Mexico,[31] it was noted that a significant portion of the Indian labor force were employed in low skilled occupations.

For example, 47 companies were surveyed in Phoenix having a total employment of 36,576 persons in 1971. Of this total, 26,237 were males and 10,339 were females. Minorities made up about 16 percent of the labor force. American Indians comprised less than one percent of the minority employment, and only .008 percent of the entire employment in these 47 companies. (Table 28)

Twenty-seven companies employing a total of 14,540 persons were included in the Albuquerque survey.(Table 29) Of this total, only 471 Indians were employed by these companies. Indians comprised only 3.2 percent of the labor force, and approximately 11 percent of the minorities. A substantial number of Indians were employed in low skill occupations. Almost 65 percent of all Indian males and approximately 86 percent of all females were employed as operatives, laborers or service workers.

To summarize, two basic conclusions can be derived from the data. First, American Indians constituted only a very small part of the off-reservation labor force. Second, those Indians that are employed in off-reservation

jobs tend to be concentrated in low-skill and low-paying occupations. These conclusions appear to be valid for both Arizona and New Mexico.

TABLES

Table 1
Reservation Employment By Industry Class
(Number and Percent)

Reservation	Fort Apache		San Carlos		Papago		Acoma		Laguna	
Industry Class	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Agriculture, forestry and fisheries	30	8.6	32	16.6	57	30.2	12	9.3	10	5.9
Mining	-	-	5	2.6	3	1.6	21	16.3	22	12.9
Contract construction	6	1.7	4	2.1	11	5.8	9	7.0	7	4.1
Manufacturing	70	20.0	7	3.6	4	2.1	8	6.2	33	19.4
Transportation & related services	1	0.3	-	-	-	-	4	3.1	4	2.4
Wholesale and retail trade	22	6.3	17	8.8	7	3.7	23	17.8	5	2.9
Services	52	14.9	23	11.9	44	23.3	13	10.1	21	12.4
Government	169	48.3	105	54.4	63	33.3	39	30.2	66	38.8
Total	350	100.1	193	100.0	189	100.0	129	100.0	168	98.8

SOURCE: Indian Manpower Resources In the Southwest: A Pilot Study.

Table 2

1971 MINORITY GROUP STUDY

ARIZONA

FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AS OF NOVEMBER 30, 1971

PAY SYSTEM	TOTAL FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES	NEGRO		SPANISH SURNAMED		AMERICAN INDIAN		ORIENTAL		ALL OTHER EMPLOYEES	
	NUMBER	NUMBER	PCT	NUMBER	PCT	NUMBER	PCT	NUMBER	PCT	NUMBER	PCT
TAL ALL PAY SYSTEMS..	27,542	726	2.6	2,485	9.0	4,125	15.0	111	.4	20,095	73.0
TAL GENERAL SCHEDULE R SIMILAR.....	15,728	329	2.1	804	5.1	2,823	17.9	75	.5	11,697	74.4
GS- 1 THRU 4	4,699	106	2.3	242	5.2	1,981	42.2	12	.3	2,358	50.2
GS- 5 THRU 8	4,401	75	1.7	365	8.3	554	12.6	31	.7	3,376	76.7
GS- 9 THRU 11	4,010	135	3.4	143	3.6	237	5.9	20	.5	3,475	86.7
GS-12 THRU 13	2,183	12	.5	46	2.1	40	1.8	10	.5	2,075	95.1
GS-14 THRU 15	430	1	.2	8	1.9	11	2.6	2	.5	408	94.9
GS-16 THRU 18	5									5	100.0
TAL WAGE SYSTEMS.....	6,335	204	3.2	1,040	16.4	1,264	20.0	18	.3	3,809	60.1
TAL REGULAR NSUPERVISORY.....	5,035	177	3.5	860	17.1	1,070	21.3	14	.3	2,914	57.9
WG- 1 THRU 3	886	63	7.1	152	17.2	361	40.7	4	.5	306	34.5
WG- 4 THRU 6	1,101	59	5.4	226	20.5	230	20.9	4	.4	582	52.9
WG- 7 THRU 9	1,516	36	2.4	274	18.1	358	23.6	3	.2	845	55.7
WG-10 THRU 12	1,518	19	1.3	206	13.6	121	8.0	2	.1	1,170	77.1
WG-13 THRU 15	14			2	14.3			1	7.1	11	78.6
TAL REGULAR LEADER...	314	5	1.6	63	20.1	47	15.0	1	.3	198	63.1
WL- 1 THRU 3	25			5	20.0	17	68.0			3	12.0
WL- 4 THRU 6	33	2	6.1	8	24.2	4	12.1			19	57.6
WL- 7 THRU 9	118	1	.8	29	24.6	23	19.5			65	55.1
WL-10 THRU 12	138	2	1.4	21	15.2	3	2.2	1	.7	111	80.4
WL-13 THRU 15											

SOURCE: Minority Group Employment in the Federal Government: November 30, 1971
U.S.Civil Service Commission SM 70-71B Table 3-4b p.372-373

Table 2 (continued)

1971 MINORITY GROUP STUDY

ARIZONA

FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AS OF NOVEMBER 30, 1971

PAY SYSTEM	TOTAL FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES	NEGRO		SPANISH SURNAMED		AMERICAN INDIAN		ORIENTAL		ALL OTHER EMPLOYEES	
	NUMBER	NUMBER	PCT	NUMBER	PCT	NUMBER	PCT	NUMBER	PCT	NUMBER	PCT
TOTAL REGULAR SUPERVISORY.....	539	15	2.8	62	11.5	62	11.5			400	74.2
WS- 1 THRU 3	42	5	11.9	12	28.6	8	19.0			17	40.5
WS- 4 THRU 6	71	3	4.2	15	21.1	8	11.3			45	63.4
WS- 7 THRU 9	197	4	2.0	20	10.2	40	20.3			133	67.5
WS-10 THRU 12	195	3	1.5	14	7.2	5	2.6			173	88.7
WS-13 THRU 15	34			1	2.9	1	2.9			32	94.1
WS-16 THRU 17											
WS-18 THRU 19											
TOTAL OTHER WAGE SYSTEM	447	7	1.6	55	12.3	85	19.0	3	.7	297	66.4
UP THRU $5,499	32	2	6.3	18	56.3					12	37.5
$ 5,500 THRU $6,999	87	2	2.3	13	14.9	45	51.7	1	1.1	26	29.9
$ 7,000 THRU $7,999	42			4	9.5	18	42.9			20	47.6
$ 8,000 THRU $8,999	59	2	3.4	12	20.3	8	13.6			37	62.7
$ 9,000 THRU $9,999	154	1	.6	8	5.2	7	4.5	1	.6	137	89.0
$10,000 THRU $13,999	73					7	9.6	1	1.4	65	89.0
$14,000 THRU $17,999											
$18,000 AND OVER											
TOTAL POSTAL FIELD SERVICE.....	5,093	190	3.7	630	12.4	34	.7	13	.3	4,226	83.0
PFS- 1 THRU 5*	4,211	173	4.1	534	12.7	25	.6	13	.3	3,466	82.3
PFS- 6 THRU 9	741	16	2.2	88	11.9	8	1.1			629	84.9
PFS-10 THRU 12	118	1	.8	6	5.1	1	.8			110	93.2
PFS-13 THRU 16	21			2	9.5					19	90.5
PFS-17 THRU 19	2									2	100.0
PFS-20 THRU 21											
TOTAL OTHER PAY SYSTEMS	386	3	.8	11	2.8	4	1.0	5	1.3	363	94.0
UP THRU $6,499	54			10	18.5	3	5.6	1	1.9	40	74.1
$ 6,500 THRU $ 9,999	49	1	2.0							48	98.0
$10,000 THRU $13,999	198	1	.5	1	.5	1	.5	2	1.0	193	97.5
$14,000 THRU $17,999	39	1	2.6							38	97.4
$18,000 THRU $25,999	42							2	4.8	40	95.2
$26,000 AND OVER	4									4	100.0

* INCLUDES 4TH CLASS POSTMASTERS AND RURAL CARRIERS

SOURCE: Minority Group Employment in the Federal Government: November 30, 1971.U.S.Civil Service Commission SM 70-71B Table 3-4b p.372-373

Table 3

1971 MINORITY GROUP STUDY

NEW MEXICO

FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AS OF NOVEMBER 30, 1971

PAY SYSTEM	TOTAL FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES	NEGRO		SPANISH SURNAMED		AMERICAN INDIAN		ORIENTAL		ALL OTHER EMPLOYEES	
	NUMBER	NUMBER	PCT	NUMBER	PCT	NUMBER	PCT	NUMBER	PCT	NUMBER	PCT
TOTAL ALL PAY SYSTEMS..	24,119	368	1.5	6,136	25.4	3,318	13.8	52	.2	14,245	59.1
TOTAL GENERAL SCHEDULE OR SIMILAR.....	16,638	244	1.5	3,008	18.1	2,412	14.5	46	.3	10,928	65.7
GS- 1 THRU 4	4,117	52	1.3	1,014	24.6	1,481	36.0	10	.2	1,560	37.9
GS- 5 THRU 8	4,728	60	1.3	1,229	26.0	628	13.3	15	.3	2,796	59.1
GS- 9 THRU 11	4,189	95	2.3	484	11.6	234	5.6	10	.2	3,366	80.4
GS-12 THRU 13	2,925	33	1.1	260	8.9	57	1.9	7	.2	2,568	87.8
GS-14 THRU 15	656	4	.6	21	3.2	12	1.8	4	.6	615	93.8
GS-16 THRU 18	23									23	100.0
TOTAL WAGE SYSTEMS.....	4,588	81	1.8	1,923	41.9	802	17.5	1		1,781	38.8
TOTAL REGULAR NONSUPERVISORY.....	3,850	70	1.8	1,673	43.5	718	18.6	1		1,388	36.1
WG- 1 THRU 3	654	30	4.6	260	39.8	235	35.9			129	19.7
WG- 4 THRU 6	661	12	1.8	310	46.9	173	26.2			166	25.1
WG- 7 THRU 9	1,081	16	1.5	507	46.9	247	22.8			311	28.8
WG-10 THRU 12	1,371	12	.9	577	42.1	63	4.6	1	.1	718	52.4
WG-13 THRU 15	83			19	22.9					64	77.1
TOTAL REGULAR LEADER...	217	3	1.4	77	35.5	39	18.0			98	45.2
WL- 1 THRU 3	39	3	7.7	18	46.2	10	25.6			8	20.5
WL- 4 THRU 6	23			13	56.5	3	13.0			7	30.4
WL- 7 THRU 9	68			23	33.8	23	33.8			22	32.4
WL-10 THRU 12	85			22	25.9	3	3.5			60	70.6
WL-13 THRU 15	2			1	50.0					1	50.0

Table continued

Table 3 (continued)

1971 MINORITY GROUP STUDY

NEW MEXICO

FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AS OF NOVEMBER 30, 1971

PAY SYSTEM	TOTAL FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES	NEGRO		SPANISH SURNAMED		AMERICAN INDIAN		ORIENTAL		ALL OTHER EMPLOYEES	
	NUMBER	NUMBER	PCT	NUMBER	PCT	NUMBER	PCT	NUMBER	PCT	NUMBER	PCT
TOTAL REGULAR SUPERVISORY.....	456	7	1.5	141	30.9	38	8.3			270	59.2
WS- 1 THRU 3	44	1	2.3	31	70.5	2	4.5			10	22.7
WS- 4 THRU 6	43			21	48.8	3	7.0			19	44.2
WS- 7 THRU 9	176	4	2.3	46	26.1	29	16.5			97	55.1
WS-10 THRU 12	157	2	1.3	38	24.2	3	1.9			114	72.6
WS-13 THRU 15	32			4	12.5	1	3.1			27	84.4
WS-16 THRU 17	4			1	25.0					3	75.0
WS-18 THRU 19											
TOTAL OTHER WAGE SYSTEM	65	1	1.5	32	49.2	7	10.8			25	38.5
UP THRU $5,499	9			4	44.4	1	11.1			4	44.4
$ 5,500 THRU $6,999	12	1	8.3	9	75.0	2	16.7				
$ 7,000 THRU $7,999	19			16	84.2	1	5.3			2	10.5
$ 8,000 THRU $8,999	4			2	50.0	2	50.0				
$ 9,000 THRU $9,999	17									17	100.0
$10,000 THRU $13,999	3			1	33.3					2	66.7
$14,000 THRU $17,999	1					1	100.0				
$18,000 AND OVER											
TOTAL POSTAL FIELD SERVICE.....	2,578	39	1.5	1,196	46.4	34	1.3	3	.1	1,306	50.7
PFS- 1 THRU 5*	2,101	37	1.8	977	46.5	29	1.4	3	.1	1,055	50.2
PFS- 6 THRU 9	402	2	.5	189	47.0	5	1.2			206	51.2
PFS-10 THRU 12	64			24	37.5					40	62.5
PFS-13 THRU 16	10			6	60.0					4	40.0
PFS-17 THRU 19	1									1	100.0
PFS-20 THRU 21											
TOTAL OTHER PAY SYSTEMS	315	4	1.3	9	2.9	70	22.2	2	.6	230	73.0
UP THRU $6,499	101	2	2.0	5	5.0	69	68.3			25	24.8
$ 6,500 THRU $ 9,999	30	1	3.3	2	6.7			1	3.3	26	86.7
$10,000 THRU $13,999	135	1	.7					1	.7	133	98.5
$14,000 THRU $17,999	23					1	4.3			22	95.7
$18,000 THRU $25,999	16			1	6.3					15	93.8
$26,000 AND OVER	10			1	10.0					9	90.0

* INCLUDES 4TH CLASS POSTMASTERS AND RURAL CARRIERS

SOURCE: Minority Group Employment in the Federal Government: November 30, 1971, U.S.Civil Service Commission SM 70-71B, Table 3-32A, p.428-429

Table 4

Grade Level Distribution of GS Employees by Race - Bureau of Indian Affairs - Arizona 1971

Grade Level	Total	Negro	Spanish Surnamed	Oriental	American Indian	Other
1	77				75	2
2	17				17	
3	403	1	2		393	7
4	704	4	2		664	34
5	300	1	10	1	220	68
6	42				38	4
7	141		1		77	63
8	6				4	2
9	679	72	10	2	123	472
10	9		1		1	7
11	226	16	6		62	142
12	144	5	1		27	111
13	40				7	33
14	41				9	32
15	2				2	
TOTAL	2,829	99	33	3	1,717	977

SOURCE: Bureau of Indian Affairs - Washington, D.C. - Personnel Division

Table 5

Grade Level Distribution of GS Employees By Race - Bureau of Indian Affairs - New Mexico
1971

Grade Level	Total	Negro	Spanish Surnamed	Oriental	American Indian	Other
1	73				73	
2	34				34	
3	330		3		319	8
4	598	2	18		548	30
5	334	1	23		252	58
6	78		5		56	17
7	198		18		112	68
8	0					
9	586	45	43	3	131	364
10	9	2	1		2	4
11	262	10	22		58	172
12	201	2	13		29	157
13	94		2		9	83
14	47		1		7	39
15	10				3	7
TOTAL	2854	62	149	3	1633	1007

SOURCE: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington DC.- Personnel Division

Table 6

Wage Level Distribution of WB Employees By Race - Bureau of Indian Affairs - Arizona 1971

Wage Level	Total	Negro	Spanish Surnamed	Oriental	American Indian	Other
$5,000	87				87	
$5,000-4,499	1				1	
$5,500-4,999	34				33	1
$6,000-6,499	81				80	1
$6,500-6,999	96				94-	2
$7,000-7,999	109		1	1	104-	3
$8,000-8,999	188	1	1		180	6
$9,000-9,999	229	2	5		192	30
$10,000-11,999	216	3	4		147	62
$12,000-13,999	63	2	1		32	28
$14,000-15,999	7				2	5
$16,000-17,999	1					1
$18,000-19,999						
Total	1112	8	12	1	952	139

SOURCE: Bureau of Indian Affairs: Washington DC.

Table 7

Wage Level Distribution of WB Employees By Race - Bureau of Indian Affairs - New Mexico 1971

Wage Level	Total	Negro	Spanish Surnamed	Oriental	American Indian	Other
$5,000	59				59	
$5,000-4,499	3				2	1
$5,500-4,999	43				42	1
$6,000-6,499	90	1			89	
$6,500-6,999	40				40	
$7,000-7,999	99		3		94	2
$8,000-8,999	117	1	3		108	5
$9,000-9,999	170	2	8		127	33
$10,000-11,999	42		1		32	9
$12,000-13,999	28		3		12	13
$14,000-15,999	6	1			2	3
$16,000-17,999	0					
$18,000-19,999	2				1	1
Total	699	5	18		608	68

SOURCE: Bureau of Indian Affairs: Washington DC

Table 8

Grade Level distribution of GS Employees Albuquerque Area Office: As of June 1972

Grade	Total[1]	Indians			Non-Indians[2]		
		Number	Male	Female	Number	Male	Female
1	39	39	11	28	0	-	-
2	18	18	6	12	0	-	-
3	98	94	38	66	4	-	4
4	127	116	48	68	11	2	9
5	128	105	43	62	23	6	17
6	14	11	8	3	3	1	2
7	75	43	32	11	32	16	16
8	0	0	-	-	0	--	---
9	174	55	27	28	119	57	62
10	4	2	2	-	2	1	1
11	110	24	20	4	86	73	13
12	80	15	14	1	65	60	5
13	29	1	1	-	28	26	2
14	24	3	3	-	21	20	1
15	1	0	-	-	1	1	-
16	-	0	-	-	-	--	-
TOTAL	931	536	253	283	395	263	132

SOURCE: Grade Level Distribution by Minority and Sex, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Albuquerque, New Mexico Area - As of 6/30/72

[1] Includes total area office employment (both Indian and non-Indian).

[2] Non-Indian category includes Negro, Spanish-Surnamed, Oriental and White.

Table 9

Grade Level distribution of GS Employees Navajo Area Office: As of June 1972

Grade	Total[1]	Indians			Non-Indians[2]		
		Number	Male	Female	Number	Male	Female
1	95	95	31	64	0	—	—
2	38	38	13	25	0	—	
3	573	557	130	427	16	6	10
4	1091	999	240	759	92	23	69
5	301	205	91	114	96	43	53
6	95	77	37	40	18	8	10
7	166	77	48	29	89	38	51
8	0	0	—	—	0	—	—
9	1006	145	59	86	861	427	434
10	10	0	—	—	10	8	2
11	254	60	42	18	194	146	48
12	112	28	27	1	84	76	8
13	39	8	7	1	31	28	3
14	22	3	3	—	19	18	1
15	1	1	1	—	0	—	—
16	0	0	—	—	0	—	
TOTAL	3796	2293	729	1564	1503	817	686

SOURCE: Grade Level Distribution by Minority and Sex, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Albuquerque, New Mexico Area - As of 6/30/72

[1] Includes total area office employment (both Indian and non-Indian).

[2] Non-Indian category includes Negro, Spanish-Surnamed, Oriental and White.

Table 10

Grade Level distribution of GS Employees Phoenix Area Office: As of June 1972

Grade	Total[1]	Indians			Non-Indians[2]		
		Number	Male	Female	Number	Male	Female
1	45	45	20	25	–	–	–
2	7	7	6	1	–	–	–
3	90	82	30	52	8	–	8
4	183	155	51	104	28	10	18
5	198	140	73	67	58	17	41
6	18	15	10	5	3	–	3
7	72	46	37	9	26	13	13
8	7	5	4	1	2	1	1
9	279	59	42	17	220	101	119
10	8	1	1		7	7	–
11	144	34	25	9	110	95	15
12	109	14	12	2	95	86	9
13	26	4	4	–	22	22	–
14	31	8	8	–	23	23	–
15	2	2	2	–	–	–	–
16	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
TOTAL	1218	617	325	292	601	374	227

SOURCE: Grade Level Distribution by Minority and Sex, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Albuquerque, New Mexico Area - As of 6/30/72

[1] Includes total area office employment (both Indian and non-Indian).

[2] Non-Indian category includes Negro, Spanish-Surnamed, Oriental and White.

Table 11
Wage Board Distribution of Indians and Non-Indians by Area Office: As of June 1972

Wage Level	PHOENIX				NAVAJO				ALBUQUERQUE			
	INDIAN		NON-INDIAN		INDIAN		NON-INDIAN		INDIAN		NON-INDIAN	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Up thru $5,499	1	1	0	0	19	1	0	0	9	0	0	0
$5,500 - $6,999	21	31	1	0	269	101	2	2	29	14	0	0
$7,000 - $7,999	45	12	6	1	81	67	7	6	29	20	3	0
$8,000 - $8,999	59	7	9	0	193	18	16	0	17	4	3	1
$9,000 - $9,999	51	14	27	1	185	92	74	4	27	2	5	0
$10,000-$13,999	91	1	78	0	117	27	73	3	17	1	7	0
$14,000- $17,999	12	0	3	0	3	0	11	0	1	0	0	0
$18,000- and over	4	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total Wage System	284	48	125	2	871	306	184	15	129	41	18	1

SOURCE: Grade level distribution by minority and sex-Bureau of Indian Affairs - Albuquerque, Phoenix and Navajo Areas 6/30/72

[1] Non-Indian includes Negro, Spanish Surnamed, Oriental and White.
M-Male
F-Female

Profile of New Mexico's State Agencies

Table 12

STATE AGENCIES	MEDIAN SALARY RANGE	MEDIAN EDUCATION LEVEL	AVERAGE MONTHLY SALARY	AVERAGE YRS. & MOS. IN AGENCY	AVERAGE AGE
COMMISSION ON AGING	40	3 YEARS OF COLLEGE	$649	3 - 9	51
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL	35	12TH GRADE	$585	2 - 7	42
ALCOHOLISM COMMISSION	34	12TH GRADE	$539	4 - 11	49
ARTS COMMISSION	32	3 YEARS OF COLLEGE	$626	1 - 11	51
ATTORNEY GENERAL	47	4 YEARS OF COLLEGE	$904	2 - 2	35
STATE AUDITOR	45	3 YEARS OF COLLEGE	$941	1 - 5	37
AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING	35	12TH GRADE	$619	3 - 0	31
AVIATION BOARD	30	12TH GRADE	$781	4 - 7	38
BANKING DEPARTMENT	40	2 YEARS OF COLLEGE	$831	5 - 1	45
BARBER EXAMINERS BOARD	41	12TH GRADE	$820	10 - 7	44
CARRIE TINGLEY HOSPITAL	26	12TH GRADE	$410	5 - 0	43
CHILDREN & YOUTH	31	12TH GRADE	$555	1 - 4	34
CIVIL DEFENSE	39	2 YEARS OF COLLEGE	$609	6 - 4	47
CONSTRUCTION LICENSING BOARDS	42	12TH GRADE	$681	6 - 5	46
CORPORATION COMMISSION	32	12TH GRADE	$617	6 - 2	41
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS	35	12TH GRADE	$555	6 - 3	39
COSMETOLOGY BOARD	25	10TH GRADE	$493	1 - 10	31
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT	53	1 YEAR OF COLLEGE	$849	8 - 2	34
DRY CLEANING BOARD	38	10TH GRADE	$618	7 - 1	36
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	53	1 YEAR OF COLLEGE	$902	2 - 11	39
BOARD OF EDUCATIONAL FINANCE	20	4 YEARS OF COLLEGE	$954	4 - 2	36
EDUCATIONAL RETIREMENT BOARD	34	1 YEAR OF COLLEGE	$628	4 - 1	33
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY COMMISSION	37	1 YEAR OF COLLEGE	$618	5 - 9	33
STATE ENGINEER	33	2 YEARS OF COLLEGE	$720	9 - 1	43
ENGINEER & LAND SURVEYORS	30	12TH GRADE	$482	4 - 7	34
STATE FAIR	32	11TH GRADE	$548	6 - 7	32
DEPT. OF FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION	30	12TH GRADE	$509	3 - 4	40
FORESTRY DEPARTMENT	37	2 YEARS OF COLLEGE	$594	4 - 6	37
GAME & FISH DEPARTMENT	38	1 YEAR OF COLLEGE	$687	9 - 4	39
HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES	37	2 YEARS OF COLLEGE	$595	6 - 2	40
HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT	33	12TH GRADE	$551	7 - 2	40
DEPT. OF HOSPITALS & INSTITUTIONS	28	12TH GRADE	$404	4 - 10	40
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION	37	1 YEAR OF COLLEGE	$782	1 - 1	32
INDIAN AFFAIRS COMMISSION	39	4 YEARS OF COLLEGE	$995	1 - 0	40
INTER-TRIBAL CEREMONIAL ASSOC.	-	12TH GRADE	$512	6 - 1	45
INVESTMENT COUNCIL	39	2 YEARS OF COLLEGE	$972	8 - 5	37
LABOR & INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION	35	12TH GRADE	$647	5 - 4	37
LAND OFFICE	34	12TH GRADE	$595	6 - 5	43
LAW ENFORCEMENT ACADEMY	43	2 YEARS OF COLLEGE	$758	0 - 10	47
STATE LIBRARY	30	1 YEAR OF COLLEGE	$510	5 - 4	39
LIQUEFIED PETROLEUM GAS COMM.	35	12TH GRADE	$643	11 - 2	51
LIVESTOCK BOARD	36	12TH GRADE	$505	6 - 8	45
MANPOWER PLANNING	44	3 YEARS OF COLLEGE	$917	0 - 5	33
MEDICAL EXAMINERS BOARD	23	12TH GRADE	$457	9 - 7	41
MINE INSPECTORS	46	12TH GRADE	$770	7 - 4	46
MOTOR TRANSPORTATION	32	12TH GRADE	$478	2 - 10	40
MOTOR VEHICLE	27	12TH GRADE	$423	3 - 6	36
MUSEUM OF NEW MEXICO	27	1 YEAR OF COLLEGE	$594	3 - 6	34
HOUSING BOARD	27	12TH GRADE	$528	1 - 0	38
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION	34	12TH GRADE	$734	11 - 3	43
OIL & GAS ACCOUNTING COMMISSION	31	1 YEAR OF COLLEGE	$603	4 - 4	32
OLD LINCOLN COUNTY MEMORIAL	24	11TH GRADE	$498	4 - 5	47
PARK & RECREATION COMMISSION	26	12TH GRADE	$433	3 - 10	42
STAFF PERSONNEL BOARD	37	12TH GRADE	$598	1 - 9	30
PHARMACY BOARD	45	12TH GRADE	$678	4 - 5	45
PLANNING OFFICE	43	4 YEARS OF COLLEGE	$704	1 - 4	35
PROPERTY APPRAISAL	37	12TH GRADE	$849	4 - 0	39
PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT	31	12TH GRADE	$617	6 - 4	35
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	49	12TH GRADE	$1,075	4 - 7	52
PURCHASING AGENT	31	12TH GRADE	$634	1 - 6	46
RACING COMMISSION	30	10TH GRADE	$643	6 - 10	34
RADIO COMMUNICATIONS	42	10TH GRADE	$720	2 - 0	37
REAL ESTATE COMMISSION	26	12TH GRADE	$422	0 - 8	24
RECORDS & ARCHIVES COMMISSION	36	10TH GRADE	$585	3 - 4	35
BUREAU OF REVENUE	37	12TH GRADE	$587	4 - 4	40
SECRETARY OF STATE	29	1 YEAR OF COLLEGE	$557	1 - 2	35
SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION	30	12TH GRADE	$585	3 - 4	28
SURPLUS PROPERTY	28	12TH GRADE	$481	8 - 0	37
TAX APPEAL BOARD	-	12TH GRADE	$570	1 - 1	47
TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMISSION	37	12TH GRADE	$723	2 - 10	41
STATE TREASURER	32	12TH GRADE	$673	8 - 4	45
VETERANS SERVICE COMMISSION	35	12TH GRADE	$545	7 - 10	44
VETERANS APPROVAL COMMITTEE	40	4 YEARS OF COLLEGE	$685	5 - 6	38
ALL AGENCIES:	33	12TH GRADE	$548	6 - 7	39

SOURCE: Minority Groups in State Government: A report to the Governor by the New Mexico State Personnel Board (1972) Table 8 p.18

Table 13

Monthly Salaries of New Mexico State Employees By Ethnic Group
1971

Monthly Salary	All Groups	Anglo	Spanish Surnamed	American Indian	Negro	Other Or Unreported
Hourly Employees	3.1%	3.3%	2.6%	9.1%	11.5%	17.4%
Under $400 Per Month	29.9	16.8	39.4	33.3	52.9	39.1
$400-$499 Per Month	19.6	14.8	23.1	26.3	11.5	13.0
$500-$599 Per Month	14.5	16.1	13.3	15.2	5.7	17.4
$600-$699 Per Month	13.2	17.8	10.1	6.6	12.6	4.3
$700-$799 Per Month	6.6	9.7	4.5	5.1	1.1	--
$800-$899 Per Month	3.6	5.4	2.3	2.0	2.3	
$900-$999 Per Month	4.0	6.5	2.2	1.0	2.3	4.3
Over $999 Per Month	5.4	9.6	2.5	1.5	0	4.3
Total Percent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

SOURCE: Minority Groups In State Government: A report to the Governor by the New Mexico State Personnel Board (1972) Table 5 p.10

Table 14

Percentage of Classified Employees, by Ethnic Group and Sex, Above the Median Salary Range for their Agency-1971

STATE AGENCIES	ALL GROUPS	ANGLO	SPANISH	INDIAN	NEGRO	OTHER OR UNREPORTED	MALE	FEMALE
COMMISSION ON AGING	50.0%	40.0%	66.7%	-	-	-	100%	20.0%
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL	37.5%	0%	40.0%	-	-	-	41.7%	25.0%
ALCOHOLISM COMMISSION	48.5%	54.6%	27.3%	-	0%	-	65.0%	13.0%
ARTS COMMISSION	50.0%	50.0%	-	-	-	-	-	50.0%
ATTORNEY GENERAL	47.4%	77.8%	22.2%	-	0%	-	66.7%	14.3%
STATE AUDITOR	44.0%	60.0%	35.0%	-	-	-	61.1%	0%
AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING	50.0%	92.3%	39.2%	-	-	-	77.1%	17.2%
AVIATION BOARD	50.0%	-	50.0%	-	-	-	-	50.0%
BANKING DEPARTMENT	46.2%	75.0%	0%	-	-	-	85.7%	0%
BARBER EXAMINERS	0%	-	0%	-	-	-	-	0%
CARRIE TINGLEY HOSPITAL	44.4%	53.9%	30.0%	-	-	-	39.0%	47.1%
CHILDREN & YOUTH	50.0%	100%	25.0%	-	-	-	66.7%	33.3%
CIVIL DEFENSE	33.3%	25.0%	50.0%	-	-	-	25.0%	50.0%
CONSTRUCTION LICENSING BOARDS	3.8%	4.9%	0%	-	-	-	6.1%	0%
CORPORATION COMMISSION	48.6%	97.5%	41.5%	-	-	-	72.0%	35.6%
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS	37.6%	43.4%	35.7%	25.0%	25.0%	-	42.4%	20.4%
COSMETOLOGY BOARD	50.0%	-	50.0%	-	-	-	-	50.0%
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT	50.0%	66.7%	41.4%	-	-	-	53.8%	44.4%
DRY CLEANING BOARD	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	0%
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	48.4%	61.9%	31.9%	50.0%	0%	-	70.6%	32.6%
BOARD OF EDUCATIONAL FINANCE	50.0%	100%	33.3%	-	-	-	-	50.0%
EDUCATIONAL RETIREMENT BOARD	46.1%	50.0%	44.4%	-	-	-	100%	30.0%
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY COMMISSION	49.5%	63.7%	43.1%	26.9%	20.0%	28.6%	63.0%	32.1%
STATE ENGINEER	42.6%	52.7%	14.6%	-	-	-	60.0%	3.2%
ENGINEER & LAND SURVEYORS	33.3%	0%	50.0%	-	-	-	-	33.3%
STATE FAIR	44.4%	75.0%	0%	-	0%	-	37.5%	100%
DEPT. OF FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION	43.5%	73.3%	30.8%	-	100%	-	43.2%	44.1%
FORESTRY DEPARTMENT	37.5%	53.8%	18.2%	-	-	-	45.0%	0%
GAME & FISH DEPARTMENT	47.1%	50.6%	21.8%	0%	-	0%	52.5%	21.9%
HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES	39.3%	55.9%	20.4%	6.4%	23.3%	0%	53.4%	30.7%
HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT	47.0%	62.4%	36.8%	23.3%	22.2%	50.0%	47.7%	38.7%
DEPT. OF HOSPITALS & INSTITUTIONS	49.0%	68.2%	42.4%	57.1%	60.0%	0%	52.3%	46.9%
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION	33.3%	0%	50.0%	-	-	-	50.0%	0%
INDIAN AFFAIRS COMMISSION	0%	-	0%	-	-	-	-	0%
INTER-TRIBAL CEREMONIAL ASSOC.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
INVESTMENT COUNCIL	40.0%	100%	25.0%	-	-	-	100%	0%
LABOR & INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION	42.9%	100%	27.3%	-	-	-	71.4%	14.3%
LAND OFFICE	43.2%	68.4%	37.8%	-	0%	0%	52.6%	25.9%
LAW ENFORCEMENT ACADEMY	42.0%	33.3%	100%	-	-	-	60.0%	0%
STATE LIBRARY	42.3%	64.1%	29.1%	-	-	-	30.4%	47.9%
LIQUEFIED PETROLEUM GAS COMM.	28.6%	20.0%	50.0%	-	-	-	0%	66.7%
LIVESTOCK BOARD	31.5%	31.6%	30.0%	-	-	-	35.9%	0%
MANPOWER PLANNING	66.7%	-	66.7%	-	-	-	100%	0%
MEDICAL EXAMINERS BOARD	50.0%	100%	0%	-	-	-	-	50.0%
MINE INSPECTORS	18.2%	14.3%	25.0%	-	-	-	25.0%	0%
MOTOR TRANSPORTATION	37.0%	33.9%	38.0%	66.7%	-	-	41.4%	17.6%
MOTOR VEHICLE DEPARTMENT	48.5%	48.1%	49.0%	66.7%	0%	0%	73.1%	36.9%
MUSEUM OF NEW MEXICO	46.6%	50.6%	28.6%	50.0%	-	-	41.3%	59.1%
HOUSING BOARD	33.3%	50.0%	0%	-	-	-	-	33.3%
OIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION	48.6%	60.7%	26.7%	-	-	-	90.0%	4.6%
OIL & GAS ACCOUNTING	47.4%	100%	37.5%	-	-	-	61.5%	16.7%
OLD LINCOLN COUNTY MEMORIAL	10.0%	33.3%	0%	-	-	-	0%	14.3%
PARK & RECREATION COMMISSION	48.5%	61.5%	40.0%	0%	0%	-	44.0%	75.0%
STAFF PERSONNEL BOARD	45.6%	60.4%	20.6%	50.0%	-	-	82.6%	22.9%
PHARMACY BOARD	33.3%	50.0%	0%	-	-	-	50.0%	0%
PLANNING OFFICE	43.1%	53.6%	25.9%	50.0%	-	-	66.7%	4.5%
PROPERTY APPRAISAL	42.5%	66.7%	33.3%	0%	-	-	58.3%	18.6%
PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT	50.0%	100%	47.6%	100%	-	-	57.1%	40.0%
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	50.0%	62.5%	0%	-	-	-	71.4%	0%
PURCHASING AGENT	50.0%	83.3%	16.7%	-	-	-	100%	40.0%
[illegible] COMMISSION	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	-	0%
RADIO COMMUNICATIONS	26.1%	27.6%	20.0%	-	-	-	31.6%	0%
REAL ESTATE COMMISSION	33.3%	-	33.3%	-	-	-	-	33.3%
RECORDS & ARCHIVES COMMISSION	47.4%	66.7%	30.0%	-	-	-	50.0%	42.9%
BUREAU OF REVENUE	45.1%	66.1%	31.8%	0%	33.3%	0%	67.0%	15.4%
SECRETARY OF STATE	45.5%	33.3%	50.0%	-	-	-	50.0%	44.4%
SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION	50.0%	100%	0%	-	-	-	100%	0%
SURPLUS PROPERTY	45.4%	0%	50.0%	-	-	-	57.1%	50.0%
TAX APPEAL BOARD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMISSION	40.0%	66.7%	0%	-	-	-	100%	0%
STATE TREASURER	36.4%	50.0%	33.3%	-	-	0%	0%	44.4%
VETERANS SERVICE COMMISSION	16.0%	0%	20.0%	-	-	-	7.7%	28.6%
VETERANS APPROVAL COMMITTEE	0%	0%	-	-	-	-	0%	-
ALL AGENCIES	47.0%	66.6%	34.0%	12.0%	27.0%	25.6%	65.0%	30.3%

SOURCE: Minority Groups in State Government: A report to the Governor by the New Mexico State Personnel Board (1972) Table 9 p.19

Table 15

Education Level Of State Employees, By Ethnic Group: New Mexico

Grade Completed	All[1] Groups	Anglo	Spanish Surnamed	American Indian	Negro	Others Or Unreported
9th Grade	89.1%	94.8%	85.0%	81.3%	91.7%	88.3%
10th Grade	86.5	93.2	81.6	78.3	90.6	--
11th Grade	82.3	90.7	76.2	73.2	84.9	--
12th Grade	78.7	88.5	71.5	69.1	80.3	82.4
1st Year of College	37.2	56.1	23.3	23.4	38.9	41.2
2nd Year of College	29.7	48.3	16.1	16.3	26.3	23.6
3rd Year of College	23.9	40.8	11.6	10.7	21.7	--
4th Year of College	20.4	36.1	9.0	7.1	17.1	11.8
1 Year of Graduate Study	8.0	15.2	2.7	2.5	5.6	--
2 Years of Graduate Study	5.1	9.8	1.6	1.5	4.5	--
3 Years of Graduate study	2.6	4.9	0.9	1.0	3.4	5.9
4 Years or More	1.5	2.7	0.6	0.5	1.1	--

SOURCE: Minority Groups in State Government: A report to the Governor by the New Mexico State Personnel Board (1972), Table 6 p.13

[1] Percentage of each group having completed indicated level or higher.

Table 16
Minority Groups Report - New Mexico

11/15/71 MINORITY GROUP REPORT PART I STATE TOTALS

	ANGLO			SPANISH			INDIAN			NEGRO			ORIENTAL			UNSPECIFIED			TOTALS		
	MALE	FEM	TOT	MALE	FEM	TOT	MALE	FEM	TOT	MALE	FEM	TOT	MALE	FEM	TOT	MALE	FEM	TOT	MALE	FEM	ALL
NUMBER	2706	1715	4422	3530	2283	5227	138	60	198	28	59	87	2	2	4	11	6	19	6424	4130	10557
PERCENT			41.8			55.1			1.8			0.8			0.0			0.1			100
MONTHLY EMPLOYEES	77	69	147	89	63	152	12	6	18	4	6	10				2	2	4	184	146	331
UNDER $400 PER MO	209	474	743	1087	1209	2296	41	25	66	8	38	46		1	1	9	3	8	1410	1750	3160
$400 - $499 PER MO	389	268	657	842	505	1347	38	14	52	5	5	10	1	1	2	1		1	1276	793	2069
$500 - $599 PER MO	407	305	712	508	270	778	23	7	30	2	3	5	1		1	1	1	2	940	586	1527
$600 - $699 PER MO	401	304	705	443	143	586	9	4	13	6	5	11				1		1	940	456	1396
$700 - $799 PER MO	272	157	429	198	63	261	8	2	10		1	1							478	223	701
$800 - $899 PER MO	183	49	232	113	23	136	3	1	4	2		2							306	73	379
$900 - $999 PER MO	243	45	288	121	6	127	1	1	2	1	1	2							366	53	420
OVER $999 PER MO	380	44	424	140	6	146	3		3							1		1	524	50	574
LESS THAN 9TH GRADE	185	41	226	667	200	867	31	6	37	5	2	7				2		2	890	249	1139
9TH GRADE	55	16	71	143	57	200	4	2	6	1		1					1	1	203	76	279
10TH GRADE	77	35	112	225	92	317	10		10	1	4	5							313	131	444
11TH GRADE	65	34	99	184	88	272	7	1	8	2	2	4							258	125	383
12TH GRADE OR GED	753	674	1428	1316	1490	2806	57	33	90	9	27	36				3	4	7	2138	2220	4367
1 YEAR COLLEGE	201	142	343	261	160	421	6	8	14	1	10	11	1		1	1	1	2	471	321	792
2 YEARS COLLEGE	216	117	333	180	84	264	8	3	11		4	4	1	1	2				405	209	614
3 YEARS COLLEGE	110	99	209	119	34	153	4	3	7	3	1	4							236	137	373
4 YEARS COLLEGE	593	331	924	316	50	366	6	3	9	4	6	10				1		1	920	390	1310
1 YEAR GRADUATE	139	98	237	50	15	65	2		2		1	1							191	114	305
2 YEARS GRADUATE	148	69	217	32	8	40	1		1	2		2		1	1				181	78	259
3 YEARS GRADUATE	66	29	95	10	5	15	1		1		1	1							79	35	114
4 YRS OR MORE GRAD	91	28	119	30	4	34	1		1										122	33	155
BERNALILLO	482	340	822	403	366	769	26	14	40	6	26	32				3		3	900	766	1666
CATRON	32	6	38	36	2	38													68	8	76
CHAVES	242	163	405	99	41	140	1		1	6	8	14					1	1	348	213	561
COLFAX	84	44	128	110	36	146	1		1										195	83	278
CURRY	36	46	82	17	4	21	1		1	1	3	4							55	53	108
DE BACA	4	6	10	8		8													12	6	18
DONA ANA	99	42	142	87	42	129				2	5	7				1		1	189	89	278
EDDY	40	51	91	12	5	17				1	3	4							55	59	112
GRANT	54	75	129	65	113	178		2	2		2	2				1		1	120	192	312
GUADALUPE	11	2	13	45	5	50	1		1										57	7	64
HARDING	2	2	4	13		13													16	2	17
HIDALGO	26	4	30	20	3	23				1	2	3							46	7	53
LEA	75	36	111	9	1	10										1		1	85	39	124
LINCOLN	61	41	102	89	33	118		1	1										147	75	222
LOS ALAMOS	1		1	1		1	1		1										3		3
LUNA	81	19	100	85	3	88				2	2	4							168	24	192
MCKINLEY	30	15	45	24	8	32	42	13	55		2	2							96	38	134
MORA	2	1	3	37	7	44	1		1										40	8	48
OTERO	41	20	61	9	6	15				1	3	4							51	29	80
QUAY	47	9	56	32	8	40	1		1		1	1							80	18	98
RIO ARRIBA	12	8	20	74	42	116	1	3	4										87	53	140
ROOSEVELT	19	14	33		3	3	1		1										80	17	97
SANDOVAL	4		4	19	2	21	3		3								2	2	26	2	28
SAN JUAN	48	45	93	23	10	33	27	11	38										98	68	166
SAN MIGUEL	76	55	131	489	329	818	2		2	1		1							568	384	952
SANTA FE	954	442	1396	1370	957	2329	27	10	37	6	2	8	2	2	4	2	1	3	2361	1416	3777
SIERRA	33	62	95	35	34	69													68	96	164
SOCORRO	12	5	17	17	11	28													29	16	45
TAOS	13	5	18	83	27	110		1	1	1		1				1		1	97	33	130
TORRANCE	15	10	25	54	2	56													70	12	82
UNION	24	3	27	25	4	29											1	1	49	7	56
VALENCIA	62	120	182	151	181	332	2	5	7										216	307	523

SOURCE: Minority Groups in State Government: A report to the Governor by the New Mexico State Personnel Board (1972)

Table 17

Ethnic Breakdown of Total Employees Employed By
Arizona State Agencies 1969-1971

	1969		1970		1971	
Group	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
White	17,800	87.2	17,653	87.6	23,483	87.2
Black	719	3.5	733	3.6	909	3.4
Mexican American	1,401	6.9	1,308	6.5	1,943	7.2
American Indian	358	1.7	306	1.5	418	1.6
Oriental	142	.7	156	.8	165	.6
Total	20,420	100.0	20,156	100.0	26,918	100.0

SOURCE: Minority Group Employment in Arizona State Agencies, Arizona Civil Rights Commission, Phoenix, Arizona 1969, 1970 and 1971 editions.

Table 18

OCCUPATIONAL GROUP OF EMPLOYEES IN EACH STATE AGENCY (1971)

The employees in Occupational Group 1 and Occupational Group 2 for each state agency are listed below. If a single set of figures is found to the right of any given agency, it indicates that particular agency has employees only in OG-1. If two sets of figures are found to the right of the listed agency, the upper figure represents those employed in OG-1 and the lower figure represents those employed in OG-2.

For example:

Corporation Commission	100	84	3	13	(OG-1 only)
Surplus Property Agency	5	5			(OG-1)
	6	4	1	1	(OG-2)

AGENCY	Total	White	Black	Mex. Amer.	Indian	Oriental
1. Accountancy Board	11	11	0	0	0	0
2. Aeronautics Department	17	17	0	0	0	0
. Agriculture & Horticulture	176	169	1	4	1	1
. Apprenticeship Council	16	16	0	0	0	0
. Arizona State University	4,522	4,133	120	177	25	67
	623	507	34	75	4	3
. Arts & Humanities Commission	16	16	0	0	0	0
. Athletic Commission	4	2	1	1	0	0
	7	0	2	5	0	0
8. Atomic Energy Commission	23	21	0	2	0	0
9. Attorney General	67	62	0	5	0	0
10. Auditor General	DID NOT REPORT					
11. Banking Department	21	21	0	0	0	0

	AGENCY	Total	White	Black	Mex. Amer.	American Indian	Oriental
12.	Barber Examiners Board	4	4	0	0	0	0
13.	Office of State Chemist	8	8	0	0	0	0
		3	2	0	1	0	0
14.	Chiropractic Examiners	3	3	0	0	0	0
15.	Civil Air Patrol	2	2	0	0	0	0
16.	Civil Rights Commission	16	5	5	4	2	0
17.	Coliseum & Exposition	38	35	2	1	0	0
		23	13	5	5	0	0
18.	Registrar of Contractors	27	27	0	0	0	0
		3	2	1	0	0	0
19.	Corporation Commission	92	80	1	11	0	0
20.	Department of Correction, Headquarters	81	74	2	4	0	0
	(a) Alpine Conservation Center	19	19	0	0	0	0
	(b) Arizona Girls School	26	24	0	1	1	0
		19	16	2	1	0	0
	(c) Arizona Youth Center	53	46	3	4	0	0
		7	6	1	0	0	0
	(d) Industrial School, Ft. Grant	73	68	1	4	0	0
		68	61	1	6	0	0
	(e) Pardons & Paroles Board	5	4	0	1	0	0
	(f) State Prison, Florence	88	73	0	14	1	0
		246	190	10	44	2	0
	(g) Safford Conservation Center	17	16	0	1	0	0
21.	Cosmetology Board	8	8	0	0	0	0
		3	2	1	0	0	0
22.	Court of Appeals, Division 1	18	16	1	1	0	0
23.	Court of Appeals, Division 2	12	11	0	1	0	0

AGENCY	Total	White	Black	Mex Amer.	American Indian	Oriental
24. Credit Union	18	14	1	3	0	0
25. Crippled Childrens Hospital	103	93	3	7	0	0
	48	22	11	12	3	0
26. Dairy Commission	4	4	0	0	0	0
27. Deaf & Blind School	23	23	0	0	0	0
	36	25	2	9	0	0
28. Dental Board	8	8	0	0	0	0
29. Economic Planning & Development	70	64	0	4	2	0
30. Education Department	354	235	25	51	39	4
	49	1	15	14	19	0
(a) Vocational Rehabilitation	172	161	3	6	1	1
31. Egg Inspection Board	10	10	0	0	0	0
32. Employment Security Commission:						
(a) Employment Service	598	381	63	106	44	4
(b) Unemployment Compensation	346	312	9	19	4	2
	12	1	8	3	0	0
33. Estate Tax Department	11	11	0	0	0	0
34. Finance Department	107	101	1	5	0	0
35. Fruit & Vegetable Standardization	20	20	0	0	0	0
36. Funeral Directors & Embalmers	4	4	0	0	0	0
37. Game & Fish Department	219	213	2	3	1	0
	30	28	0	1	1	0

	AGENCY	Total	White	Black	Mex. Amer.	Indian	Oriental
38.	Governor's Office	23	16	1	1	2	0
	(a) Civil Defense, Emergency Planning	14	14	0	0	0	0
	(b) Four Corners Regional	DID NOT REPORT					
	(c) Economic Opportunity Office	8	2	1	3	2	0
	(d) Highway Safety Coordinator	8	8	0	0	0	0
	(e) Manpower Planning	12	10	0	0	2	0
39.	Health Department	258	240	3	10	3	2
	(a) Air Polution Advisory Council	27	26	1	0	0	0
40.	Health Planning Department	21	21	0	0	0	0
41.	Highway Department	2,837 1,440	2,474 1,175	40 25	292 182	18 56	13 2
42.	State Hospital	630 224	582 158	27 43	20 21	1 2	0 0
43.	Indian Affairs Commission	11	4	0	0	7	0
44.	Industrial Commission	118	107	0	9	2	0
45.	Industries for the Blind	11	10	0	1	0	0
46.	Insurance Department	46	44	1	1	0	0
47.	Junior Colleges Board of Directors	19	19	0	0	0	0
48.	Justice Planning Agency	28	26	0	1	1	0

AGENCY	Total	White	Black	Mer. Amer.	Indian	Oriental
49. Land Department	56	51	0	5	0	0
50. Legislature:						
(a) House of Representatives	TOO BUSY TO REPORT					
(b) Legislative Council	21	19	0	1	1	0
(c) Senate	DID NOT REPORT					
51. Library & Archives & Extension	75	69	0	1	5	0
Service	1	0	1	0	0	0
52. Liquor Department	15	15	0	0	0	0
53. Livestock Sanitary Board	34	31	0	1	1	1
	130	116	0	8	6	0
5 Medical Examiners	10	10	0	0	0	0
55. Mental Retardation:						
(a) Central Office, Phoenix	17	17	0	0	0	0
(b) Childrens' Colony, Coolidge	186	174	6	5	1	0
	432	288	77	59	7	1
(c) Training Program, Tucson	18	18	0	0	0	0
56. Mine Inspector	11	8	0	3	0	0
57. Mineral Resources.	14	14	0	0	0	0
58. National Guard	26	24	0	2	0	0
	42	29	1	12	0	0
59. Naturopathic Board of Examiners	3	3	0	0	0	0

AGENCY	Total	White	Black	Mex. Amer.	Indian	Oriental
60. Northern Arizona University	786	745	4	17	15	5
	146	41	18	61	26	0
61. Nursing Board	19	18	1	0	0	0
62. Oil & Gas Conservation Commission	13	13	0	0	0	0
63. Board of Dispensing Opticians	6	6	0	0	0	0
64. Optomegry Board	3.5	3.5	0	0	0	0
65. Osteopathic Board	7	7	0	0	0	0
66. Outdoor Recreation Coordinating	7	6	0	1	0	0
67. State Parks	69	66	2	1	0	0
68. Personnel Commission	76	60	7	8	0	1
69. Pesticide Control Board	12	12	0	0	0	0
70. Pharmacy Board	13	13	0	0	0	0
71. Physical Therapy Examining Board	DID NOT REPORT					
72. Pioneers' Home, Prescott	20	19	0	1	0	0
	69	54	0	15	0	0
73. Pediatry Examiners	3	3	0	0	0	0
74. Power Authority	10	10	0	0	0	0
75. Prescott Historical Society	24	24	0	0	0	0
76. Property Tax Appeals Board	5	5	0	0	0	0
77. Property Valuation	93	87	2	4	0	0

	AGENCY	Total	White	Black	Amer. Indian	Oriental
	Psychology Board	5.5	5.5	0	0	0
79.	Public Buildings Maintenance	26	23	1	2	0
		83	45	22	16	0
80.	Public Safety Department	351	333	1	17	0
		512	474	8	25	5
81.	Racing Commission	25	25	0	0	0
82.	Real Estate Department	31	30	0	1	0
83.	Regents Board of Budget Office	19	19	0	0	0
84.	Research Coordinating Unit	DID NOT REPORT				
85.	Retirement Systems:					
	(a) Public Safety Personnel	6	6	0	0	0
	(b) State Employees & Teachers	50	50	0	0	0
86.	Secretary of State	13	12	0	1	0
87.	State Compensation Fund	474	432	7	31	4
		10	8	1	1	0
88.	Supreme Court	28	28	0	0	0
	(a) Bar Association	22	22	0	0	0
89.	Surplus Property Agency	11	11	0	0	0
		3	1	0	2	0
90.	Tax Commission	261	241	6	11	3
91.	Technical Registration Board	12	12	0	0	0

	AGENCY	Total	White	Black	Mex. Amer.	Indian	Oriental
92.	Treasurer	11	9	1	1	0	0
93.	Tuberculosis Sanitorium	75	69	1	4	1	0
		67	43	15	6	3	0
94.	University of Arizona	5,925	5,573	63	185	45	59
		965	599	137	202	24	3
95.	Veterans Service Commission	28	25	0	3	0	0
96.	Water Commission	24	24	0	0	0	0
97.	Weights and Measures	8	8	0	0	0	0
98.	Welfare Department	904	788	18	69	29	0
		54	38	5	9	2	0

Minority Group Employment in Arizona State Agencies, Arizona Civil Rights Commission (1971)

A-Supervisory
B-All Other

Table 19
ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF CITY EMPLOYEES
PHOENIX, ARIZONA, AUG 1971

DEPARTMENT	TOTAL A	TOTAL B	ANGLO A	ANGLO B	NEGRO A	NEGRO B	MEXICAN A- AMERICIANS-B	MEXICAN B	AMERICAN A-INDIAN-B	AMERICAN B	ORIENTAL A	ORIENTAL B
AIRPORT	11	136	6	94	1	14	4	28	0	0	0	0
BUDGET AND RESEARCH	1	33	1	29	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0
BUILDING AND HOUSING SAFETY	10	128	10	114	0	5	0	9	0	0	0	0
CITY COURT	3	59	3	52	0	4	0	3	0	0	0	0
CIVIL PLAZA	1	5	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ENGINEERING	1	219	1	188	0	1	0	27	0	0	0	3
FINANCE	5	107	5	94	0	1	0	13	0	0	0	0
FIRE	131	473	118	418	1	7	12	18	0	0	0	0
HUMAN RELATIONS	0	6	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0
LAW	2	40	2	32	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0
LEAP	7	99	3	34	2	37	2	26	0	2	0	0
LIBRARY	3	161	2	131	0	9	1	20	0	1	0	0
MAINTENANCE SERVICE	29	325	23	218	2	45	3	59	0	3	1	0
MANAGER	2	27	2	22	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0
MANAGEMENT INFORMATION	2	63	2	57	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	0
POLICE	132	1116	125	1031	1	21	6	62	0	1	0	1
PUBLIC HOUSING	4	57	1	13	1	16	2	28	0	0	0	0
REAL ESTATE	8	83	5	70	0	5	3	8	0	0	0	0
SANITATION	44	561	33	89	4	164	7	304	0	4	0	0
STREET MAINTENANCE	45	240	29	68	3	39	12	130	1	2	0	1
TRAFFIC ENGINEERING	13	53	4	32	0	1	9	20	0	0	0	0
WATER AND SEWERS	84	492	49	294	5	26	30	137	0	32	0	3
TOTAL	538	4482	425	3088	20	301	91	1009	1	48	1	8
	5020		3513		321		1100		49		9	

TOTAL % ANGLO - 71.9
TOTAL % BLACK - 6.3
TOTAL % AMERICAN INDIAN-less than 1%
TOTAL % MEXICAN-AMERICANS 21.9
TOTAL % ORIENTAL--less than 1%

SOURCE: City of Phoenix, Employment Report 1970-1971. Prepared by Phoenix Human Relations Dept-Phoenix Ariz

A. Supervisor
B Non-supervisor

Table 20

City of Phoenix

Departmental Ethnic Breakdown By Job Classification
August 29, 1971

Prepared by:
Phoenix Human Relation Department, Phoenix, Arizona

Date: 8-29-71

DEPARTMENT

AIRPORT	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	6	6					
Professional	6	6					
Technicians	6	6					
Office & Clerical	9	8		1			
Craftsman-Skilled	18	14		4			
Operative Semi-Skilled	38	26	1	11			
Laborers-Unskilled	6	1		5			
Service Workers	47	27	13	7			
Supervisory	11	6	1	4			
TOTAL	147	100	15	32			

BUDGET and RESEARCH	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	2	2					
Professional	13	12		1			
Technicians	13	10	1	2			
Office & Clerical	5	5					
Craftsman-Skilled							
Operative Semi-skilled							
Laborers-Unskilled							
Service Workers							
Supervisory	1	1					
TOTAL	34	30	1	3			

BUILDING AND HOUSING SAFETY	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	5	4	1				
Professional	10	8	1	1			
Technicians	1		1				
Office & Clerical	23	19	1	3			
Craftsman-Skilled	64	60	1	3			
Operative Semi-Skilled	1			1			
Laborers-Unskilled							
Service Workers	24	23		1			
Supervisory	10	10					
TOTAL	138	124	5	9			

Date: 8-29-71

DEPARTMENT

CITY COURT	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	8	7	1				
Professional							
Technicians							
Office & Clerical	51	45	3	3			
Craftsman-Skilled							
Operative Semi-Skilled							
Laborers-Unskilled							
Service Workers							
Supervisory	3	3					
TOTAL	62	55	4	3			

CIVIC PLAZA	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	2	2					
Professional	2	2					
Technicians							
Office & Clerical	1	1					
Craftsman-Skilled							
Operative Semi-Skilled							
Laborers-Unskilled							
Service Workers							
Supervisory	1	1					
TOTAL	6	6					

ENGINEERING	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	15	14				1	
Professional	23	21		1		1	
Technicians	159	131	1	26		1	
Office & Clerical	22	22					
Craftsman-Skilled							
Operative Semi-Skilled							
Laborers-Unskilled							
Service Workers							
Supervisory	1	1					
TOTAL	220	189	1	27		3	

Date: 8-20-71

DEPARTMENT

FINANCE	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	8	6		2			
Professional	36	34	1	1			
Technicians	1	1					
Office & Clerical	51	42		9			
Craftsman-Skilled							
Operative Semi-Skilled	4	3		1			
Laborers-Unskilled							
Service Workers	3	3					
Supervisory	5	5					
TOTAL	113	99	1	13			

FIRE	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	18	18					
Professional							
Technicians							
Office & Clerical	10	8	1	1			
Craftsman-Skilled							
Operative Semi-skilled							
Laborers-Unskilled							
Service Workers	415	392	6	17			
Supervisory	131	113	1	12			
TOTAL	574	533	8	30			

HUMAN RELATIONS	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	1	2					
Professional	3	1	1	1			
Technicians							
Office & Clerical	2			2			
Craftsman-Skilled							
Operative Semi-Skilled							
Laborers-Unskilled							
Service Workers							
Supervisory							
TOTAL	6	2	1	3			

Date: 8-29-71

DEPARTMENT

LAW	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	7	7					
Professional	18	16		2			
Technicians							
Office & Clerical	14	8		6			
Craftsman-Skilled							
Operative Semi-Skilled							
Laborers-Unskilled							
Service Workers	1	1					
Supervisory	2	2					
TOTAL	42	34		8			

LEAP	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	9	4	4	1			
Professional	22	13	4	5			
Technicians	2	1		1			
Office & Clerical	65	16	29	19	2		
Craftsman-Skilled							
Operative Semi-Skilled							
Laborers-Unskilled							
Service Workers							
Supervisory	7	3	2	2			
TOTAL	106	37	39	28	2		

LIBRARY	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	12	12					
Professional	34	34					
Technicians	20	20					
Office & Clerical	87	60	8	18	1		
Craftsman-Skilled							
Operative Semi-Skilled	4	1	1	2			
Laborers-Unskilled							
Service Workers	4	4					
Supervisory	3	2		1			
TOTAL	164	133	9	21	1		

Date: 8-29-71

DEPARTMENT

MAINTENANCE SERVICE	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	8	8					
Professional	1	1					
Technicians	8	6	1	1			
Office & Clerical	27	25	1	1			
Craftsman-Skilled	124	108		14	2		
Operative Semi-Skilled	21	8	4	9			
Laborers-Unskilled	43	25	6	12			
Service Workers	93	37	33	22	1		
Supervisory	29	23	2	3		1	
TOTAL	354	241	47	62	3	1	

MANAGER	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	8	7	1				
Professional	8	8					
Technicians	2	1	1				
Office & Clerical	9	6	1	2			
Craftsman-Skilled							
Operative Semi-skilled							
Laborers-Unskilled							
Service Workers							
Supervisory	2	2					
TOTAL	29	24	3	2			

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	1	1					
Professional	11	11					
Technicians	24	22			2		
Office & Clerical	26	23	1	1	1		
Craftsman-Skilled							
Operative Semi-Skilled							
Laborers-Unskilled							
Service Workers							
Supervisory	2	2					
TOTAL	64	59	1	1	3		

Date: 8-20-71

DEPARTMENT

POLICE	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	61	59	1	1			
Professional	20	17		3			
Technicians	4	4					
Office & Clerical	141	114	3	23		1	
Craftsman-Skilled							
Operative Semi-Skilled							
Laborers-Unskilled							
Service Workers	890	837	17	35	1		
Supervisory	132	125	1	6			
TOTAL	1248	1156	22	68	1	1	

PUBLIC HOUSING	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	1			1			
Professional	10	3	5	2			
Technicians							
Office & Clerical	11	8		3			
Craftsman-Skilled	15		5	10			
Operative Semi-skilled	14	2	5	7			
Laborers-Unskilled	6		1	5			
Service Workers							
Supervisory	4	1	1	2			
TOTAL	61	14	17	30			

REAL ESTATE	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	4	3		1			
Professional	4	4					
Technicians	55	43	4	3			
Office & Clerical	19	15	1	3			
Craftsman-Skilled							
Operative Semi-Skilled	1			1			
Laborers-Unskilled							
Service Workers							
Supervisory	8	5		3			
TOTAL	91	75	5	11			

Date: 8-29-71

DEPARTMENT

SANITATION	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	4	4					
Professional	1	1					
Technicians	1	1					
Office & Clerical	3	1		2			
Craftsman-Skilled	29	19	2	8			
Operative Semi-Skilled	258	33	75	150			
Laborers-Unskilled	9		3	6			
Service Workers	255	30	84	138	4		
Supervisory	44	33	4	7			
TOTAL	605	122	168	311	4		

STREET MAINTENANCE	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	2	2					
Professional	3	3					
Technicians	5	4				1	
Office & Clerical	13	12		1			
Craftsman-Skilled	26	15	2	9			
Operative Semi-skilled	169	23	29	110	2		
Laborers-Unskilled	22	4	8	10			
Service Workers							
Supervisory	45	29	3	12	1		
TOTAL	285	97	42	142	3	1	

TRAFFIC ENGINEERING	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	3	3					
Professional	7	7					
Technicians	14	14					
Office & Clerical	5	5					
Craftsman-Skilled							
Operative Semi-Skilled	23	3		20			
Laborers-Unskilled	1		1				
Service Workers							
Supervisory	13	4		9			
TOTAL	66	36	1	29			

Date: 8-29-71

DEPARTMENT

WATER AND SEWERS	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative	11	11					
Professional	16	14				2	
Technicians	29	27	1	1			
Office & Clerical	66	60	1	5			
Craftsman-Skilled	51	40	1	5	5		
Operative Semi-Skilled	181	33	7	60	25	1	
Laborers-Unskilled	89	26	10	51	2		
Service Workers	49	28	6	15			
Supervisory	84	49	5	30			
TOTAL	576	343	31	167	32	3	

	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative							
Professional							
Technicians							
Office & Clerical							
Craftsman-Skilled							
Operative Semi-skilled							
Laborers-Unskilled							
Service Workers							
Supervisory							
TOTAL							

	Total	Anglo	Negro	Mexican American	American Indian	Oriental	
Administrative							
Professional							
Technicians							
Office & Clerical							
Craftsman-Skilled							
Operative Semi-Skilled							
Laborers-Unskilled							
Service Workers							
Supervisory							
TOTAL							

Table 21

Ethnic Composition of City Employees

Tucson, Arizona, July 1971

TITLE	ANGLOS		MEXICAN AMERICANS		BLACKS		INDIANS & ORIENTALS		TOTAL
	SUPV	NON-SUPV	SUPV	NON-SUPV	SUPV	NON-SUPV	SUPV	NON-SUPV	
MAYOR's OFFICE	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
POST AUDITOR	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5
CITY MANAGER	2	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	9
PUBLIC INFO. OFFICER	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
DOCD ADMIN.	4	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	12
URBAN RENEWAL	5	6	0	1	1	2	0	0	15
PLANNING	4	22	1	2	0	0	1	0	30
INSPECTIONS	10	41	0	3	0	0	0	0	54
PUBLIC HOUSING	4	3	0	9	1	1	0	1	19
FINANCE DIRECTOR	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
BUDGET	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
ACCOUNTING	5	20	3	2	0	0	0	0	30
TREASURER	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
LICENSE-REVENUE	4	24	2	7	0	1	0	1	39
DATA PROCESSING	2	18	1	4	1	0	0	0	26
PURCHASING	5	18	1	4	0	0	0	0	28
CITY ATTORNEY	2	22	0	2	0	0	0	0	26
CITY COURTS	2	7	0	3	0	0	0	0	12
CITY CLERK	2	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	9
CITY ELECTIONS	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
PERSONNEL	4	11	0	2	0	1	0	0	18
COMMUNITY CENTER	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
POLICE ADMIN	8	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	16
FIELD SERVICES	38	226	3	22	0	4	0	1	294
DETECTIVE	13	45	6	7	0	0	0	0	65
POLICE RECORDS	8	40	0	10	1	0	0	0	59
CRIME LAB	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
POLICE TRAINING	3	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	13
POLICE TACTICAL SQUAD	3	15	0	2	0	0	0	0	12
POLICE INSP SERVICE	4	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	12
NARCO	10	5	0	3	0	0	0	0	18
POLICE-COMMUNITY REL	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
POLICE-UPGRADING	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
FIRE ADMIN	4	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	7
FIRE PREVENTION	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

Table 21 (continued)

TITLE	ANGLOS SUPV	ANGLOS NON-SUPV	MEXICAN AMERICANS SUPV	MEXICAN AMERICANS NON-SUPV	BLACKS SUPV	BLACKS NON-SUPV	INDIANS & ORIENTALS SUPV	INDIANS & ORIENTALS NON-SUPV	TOTAL
FIRE COMBAT	41	169	24	48	0	2	1	1	286
COMMUNICATIONS	6	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	21
TRAFFIC ADMIN.	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
PAINT SHOP	2	5	1	13	0	3	0	0	24
ELECTRIC SHOP	1	12	1	6	0	0	0	1	21
PARKING METERS	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
STREETS MAINTENANCE	2	12	9	76	0	7	0	3	109
STREET SWEEPERS	0	0	0	8	2	2	0	0	12
REFUSE-ADM & COLLECT	4	14	12	175	0	17	0	9	231
REFUSE DISPOSAL	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	9
BUILDING MAINTENANCE	2	9	1	8	0	0	0	0	20
AUTO SHOP	7	40	0	11	0	1	0	0	59
PUBLIC WORKS ADMIN	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
CUSTODIAN SERVICES	0	8	0	6	3	4	0	1	22
PUBLIC WORKS	8	57	0	9	0	0	0	0	74
LIBRARY	37	77	7	40	0	4	0	0	165
RECREATION	5	11	2	6	8	14	0	0	46
PARKS ADMIN	4	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	15
PARKS DIVISION	3	22	15	80	0	15	0	1	136
WATER & SEWERS	10	56	8	40	0	7	0	0	121
WATER & SEWERS ADMIN	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
WATER/SEWER ENGINEER'G	9	27	4	3	0	0	0	1	44
SEWER-MAINTENANCE	1	1	1	14	0	2	0	1	20
SEWAGE TREATMENT	6	18	0	2	0	3	0	0	29
WATER & SEWERS	5	14	11	43	0	1	0	0	74
MODEL CITIES	9	11	3	12	2	10	0	2	49
TOTALS	331	1187	113	708	19	100	2	24	2487
% OF TOTALS	13.31%	47.77%	4.54%	28.47%	.76%	4.02%	.08%	.97%	

TOTAL % ANGLO - 61.08 TOTAL % MEXICAN-AMERICAN 33.01
TOTAL % BLACK - 4.78 TOTAL % ORIENTAL-INDIAN 1.05
SOURCE: Tucson Commission on Human Relations - Annual Report 1970-71 Tucson, Arizona p19-26

TABLE 22
STATE OF ARIZONA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DIVISION OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

RACIAL AND ETHNIC STUDY OF ARIZONA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SCHOOL EMPLOYEES, SPRING, 1972

SUMMARY FOR STATE OF ARIZONA

		SPANISH SURNAME	OTHER WHITE	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	AMERICAN INDIAN	OTHER NONWHITE	TOTAL
BUSINESS MANAGERS FINANCE OFFICERS	EMPLOYEES	14	140	3	0	0	0	157
	PERCENT	8.92	89.17	1.91	0.0	0.0	0.0	
SECRETARIES CLERK-STENOS, CLERKS	EMPLOYEES	226	2206	23	2	42	2	2501
	PERCENT	9.04	88.20	0.92	0.08	1.68	0.08	
DOCTORS NURSES	EMPLOYEES	17	496	9	1	3	1	527
	PERCENT	3.23	94.12	1.71	0.19	0.57	0.19	
PSYCHOLOGIST, COUNTY OR SOCIAL WORKER	EMPLOYEES	35	163	16	1	9	0	224
	PERCENT	15.63	72.77	7.14	0.45	4.02	0.0	
SUPERVISOR-TRANSPORT CAFETERIA, CUSTODIAL	EMPLOYEES	176	1032	18	1	19	0	1246
	PERCENT	14.13	82.83	1.44	0.08	1.52	0.0	
EMPLOYEE-TRANSPORT, CAFETERIA, CUSTODIAL	EMPLOYEES	1598	5544	223	3	329	11	7708
	PERCENT	20.73	71.93	2.89	0.04	4.27	0.14	
ASSISTANTS (PAID)- OFFICE, LIBRARY, LAB	EMPLOYEES	34	189	2	0	28	0	253
	PERCENT	13.44	74.70	0.79	0.0	11.07	0.0	
AIDES (PAID)-TEACHER LIBRARY, ETC.	EMPLOYEES	1283	2850	235	12	204	12	4596
	PERCENT	27.92	62.01	5.11	0.26	4.44	0.26	
NON-CERTIFIED TOTAL EMPLOYEES	EMPLOYEES	3383	12621	529	20	634	26	17212
	PERCENT	19.65	73.33	3.07	0.12	3.68	0.15	
SUPERINTENDENTS ASST. SUPTS.	EMPLOYEES	4	166	1	0	2	0	173
	PERCENT	2.31	95.95	0.58	0.0	1.16	0.0	
PRINCIPALS ASST., ASSOC., VICE	EMPLOYEES	49	836	25	3	5	1	919
	PERCENT	5.33	90.97	2.72	0.33	0.54	0.11	
DIRECTORS-CHAIRMEN SUPERVISORS	EMPLOYEES	34	787	17	1	3	4	846
	PERCENT	4.02	93.03	2.01	0.12	0.35	0.47	
CONSULTANTS COORDINATORS	EMPLOYEES	5	101	3	0	2	1	112
	PERCENT	4.46	90.18	2.68	0.0	1.79	0.89	
GUIDANCE COUNSELORS	EMPLOYEES	6	251	9	1	4	2	273
	PERCENT	2.20	91.94	3.30	0.37	1.47	0.73	
TEACHERS-LIBRARIANS CERTIFIED	EMPLOYEES	697	16759	393	83	141	114	18187
	PERCENT	3.83	92.15	2.16	0.46	0.78	0.63	
CERTIFIED TOTAL EMPLOYEES	EMPLOYEES	795	18900	448	88	157	122	20510
	PERCENT	3.88	92.15	2.18	0.43	0.77	0.59	
TOTAL EMPLOYEES	EMPLOYEES	4178	31521	977	108	791	148	37722
	PERCENT	11.08	83.56	2.59	0.29	2.10	0.39	

SOURCE: RACIAL-ETHNIC Survey: Pupils and Employees - Arizona Department of Education Division of Equal Educational Opportunities - Spring 1972 p.34.

Table 23
Racial and Ethnic Breakdown of School Employees[1]
By County - Spring 1971: Arizona

County	Spanish Surname	Other White	Negro	Oriental	American Indian	Other Non-White	Total
Apache							
Employees	29	371	10	0	158	0	568
Percent	5.1	65.3	1.8	0.0	27.8	0.0	
Cochise							
Employees	172	1068	13	4	3	1	1261
Percent	13.6	84.7	1.0	0.3	0.2	0.1	
Coconino							
Employees	47	500	7	1	90	0	645
Percent	7.3	77.5	1.1	0.2	14.0	0.0	
Gila							
Employees	67	448	2	0	47	1	565
Percent	11.9	79.3	0.4	0.0	8.3	0.2	
Graham							
Employees	30	292	0	1	10	1	334
Percent	9.0	87.4	0.0	0.3	3.0	0.3	
Greenlee							
Employees	35	207	0	0	0	0	242
Percent	14.5	85.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Maricopa							
Employees	1112	15815	461	55	51	12	17506
Percent	6.4	90.3	2.6	0.3	0.3	0.1	
Mohave							
Employees	11	558	0	0	9	1	579
Percent	1.9	96.4	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.2	
Navajo							
Employees	27	603	11	0	110	0	751
Percent	3.6	80.3	1.5	0.0	14.6	0.0	
Pima							
Employees	942	5996	163	27	62	2	7192
Percent	13.1	83.4	2.3	0.4	0.9	0.0	

TABLE CONTINUED

Table 23 (continued)

County	Spanish Surname	Other White	Negro	Oriental	American Indian	Other Non-White	Total
Pinal							
Employees	158	1163	38	1	41	1	1402
Percent	11.3	83.0	2.7	0.1	2.9	0.1	
Santa Cruz							
Employees	73	196	0	0	0	0	269
Percent	27.1	72.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Yavapai							
Employees	32	590	0	0	3	1	626
Percent	5.1	94.2	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.2	
Yuma							
Employees	140	1067	28	2	20	4	1261
Percent	11.1	84.6	2.2	0.2	1.6	0.3	

SOURCE: Racial Ethnic Survey: Arizona Department of Education
Division of Equal Educational Opportunities

1 Includes:Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents; principals, assistant, associated, vice....directors; chairmen and supervisors, consultants, coordinators; guidance counselors; teachers-librarians; certificated; teachers aides; other classified.

Table 24

Racial and Ethnic Breakdown of Teachers-Librarians Certificated by County-Spring 1971: Arizona

County	Spanish Surname	Other White	Negro	Oriental	American Indian	Other Nonwhite	Total
Apache							
Teachers	10	280	8	0	15	0	313
Percent	3.2	89.5	2.6	0.0	4.8	0.0	
Students	510	1677	109	3	4705	4	7008
Percent	7.3	23.9	1.6	.04	67.1	.06	
Cochise							
Teachers	75	741	6	0	2	0	824
Percent	9.1	89.9	0.7	0.0	0.2	0.0	
Students	6147	11322	450	155	55	8	18137
Percent	33.9	62.4	2.5	.85	.30	.04	
Coconino							
Teachers	23	350	3	1	9	0	386
Percent	6.0	90.7	0.8	0.3	2.3	0.0	
Students	2138	8407	576	70	3391	5	14587
Percent	14.7	57.6	4.0	.48	23.3	.03	
Gila							
Teachers	23	305	2	0	3	1	334
Percent	6.9	91.3	0.6	0.0	0.9	0.3	
Students	2157	4323	24	6	1137	1	7648
Percent	28.2	56.6	.31	.08	14.9	.01	
Graham							
Teachers	3	193	0	1	0	1	198
Percent	1.5	97.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.5	
Students	1207	2793	67	10	472	4	4553
Percent	26.5	61.3	1.5	.22	10.4	.09	
Greenlee							
Teachers	6	146	0	0	0	0	152
Percent	3.9	96.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Students	1648	1555	7	3	69	3	3285
Percent	50.1	47.3	.21	.09	2.1	.09	

TABLE CONTINUED

Table 24 (continued)

County	Spanish Surname	Other White	Negro	Oriental	American Indian	Other NonWhite	Total
Maricopa							
Teachers	388	9774	249	52	14	8	10485
Percent	3.7	93.2	2.4	0.5	0.1	0.1	
Students	36657	194117	10892	1101	3344	397	246508
Percent	14.9	78.8	4.4	.45	1.4	.16	
Mohave							
Teachers	4	319	0	0	3	0	326
Percent	1.2	97.9	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	
Students	281	6014	1	9	240	3	5648
Percent	4.3	91.8	.02	.14	3.7	.05	
Navajo							
Teachers	12	402	1	0	7	0	422
Percent	2.8	95.3	0.2	0.0	1.7	0.0	
Students	677	3829	168	30	2798	1	7503
Percent	9.0	51.0	2.2	.40	37.3	.01	
Pima							
Teachers	166	3233	67	22	9	0	3497
Percent	4.7	92.5	1.9	0.6	0.3	0.0	
Students	21015	56880	3402	497	2080	17	83,891
Percent	25.1	67.8	4.1	.59	2.5	.02	
Pinal							
teachers	36	753	9	1	3	1	803
Percent	4.5	93.8	1.1	0.1	0.4	0.1	
Students	6367	8900	1012	69	1905	7	18260
Percent	34.9	48.7	5.5	.38	10.4	.04	
Santa Cruz							
Teachers	27	160	0	0	0	0	187
Percent	14.4	85.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Students	3455	910	29	14	1	0	4409
Percent	78.4	20.6	.66	.32	.02	0.0	
Yavapai							
Teachers	15	392	0	0	2	0	409
Percent	3.7	95.8	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	
Students	906	7611	35	9	257	0	8818
Percent	10.3	86.3	.40	.10	2.9	0.0	
Yuma							
Teachers	34	649	10	1	4	3	701
Percent	4.9	92.6	1.4	0.1	0.6	0.4	
Students	5129	9631	575	92	651	52	16130
Percent	31.8	59.7	3.6	.57	4.0	0.32	

SOURCE: Racial - Ethnic Survey - Arizona

Table 25

Number of Full-Time Indian Teachers Employed by Selected School Districts in New Mexico: 1969-69 School Year[1]

District and Location		Number of Indian Students Enrolled in the District 1968-69	% of the Total Enroll.	Number of Indian Teachers Employed in The District	% of the Total
Albuquerque	Bernalillo County	1704	2.1%	16	0.6%
Aztec	San Juan County	176	9.3	0	0.0
Belen	Valencia County	3	0.1	0	0
Bernalillo	Sandoval County	1287	47.5	3	2.6
Bloomfield	San Juan County	419	24.8	0	0.0
Central Consol	San Juan County	2878	76.9	15	9.6
Dulce	Rio Arriba County	578	76.1	0	0.0
Espanola	Rio Arriba County	317	5.3	2	0.9
Farmington	San Juan County	372	5.4	3	1.1
Gallup	McKinley County	6547	38.2	24	5.1
Grants	Valencia County	975	18.4	1	0.5
Jemez Mountain		66	10.1	0	0.0
Jemez Springs		319	50.3	1	3.3
Los Lunas	Valencia County	324	10.7	0	0.0
	TOTAL	16965	28.3%	65	1.6%

[1] SOURCE: 1968 Elementary and Secondary Public School Survey. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Fall 1968).

Table 26
Employment Participation Rates for American Indians In
Private Industry - New Mexico
1970

Category	Total[1] Employment	American Indian	Male	Female	Overall[2] Participation Rate %
White Collar	40,973	515	285	230	1.3
Officials & Managers	6,768	90	84	6	1.3
Professional	10,394	72	29	43	.7
Technicians	6,541	133	96	37	2.0
Sales Workers	5,405	41	30	11	.8
Office & Clerical	11,865	179	46	133	1.5
Blue Collar	29,950	2,231	1,153	1,078	7.4
Craftsman	11,102	462	365	97	4.2
Operatives	12,819	1,523	583	940	11.9
Laborers	6,029	246	205	41	4.1
Service Workers	6,412	222	98	124	3.5
Total	77,335	2,968	1,536	1,432	3.8

SOURCE: 1970 EEO-1 Report Summary By State 466 Units State - New Mexico

[1]Includes all ethnic and racial groups.

[2]Participation rate composite for male and female.

Table 27

Employment Participation Rates for American Indians In Private Industry-Arizona 1970

Occupational Category	Total Employment[1]	American Indian	Male	Female	Overall Participation Rate %[2]
White Collar	99,004	542	280	262	.5
Officials & Managers	17,129	59	57	2	.3
Professional	21,787	84	37	47	.4
Technicians	11,083	110	75	35	1.0
Sales Workers	17,959	109	74	35	.6
Office & Clerical	31,051	180	37	143	.6
Blue Collar	81,450	2,142	1,671	471	2.6
Craftsman	24,922	348	319	29	1.4
Operatives	43,322	1,005	598	407	2.3
Laborers	13,206	789	754	35	6.0
Service Workers	16,445	468	173	295	2.8
Total	196,899	3,152	2,124	1,028	1.6

SOURCE: 1970 EEO-1 Report Summary By State 982 - Units State: Arizona

1 Includes all ethnic and racial groups.

2 Participation rate composite for male and female.

N-Negro AI-American Indian
O-Oriental SS-Spanish Surname

Table 28

Indian Employment In Private Industry by Job Categories - Phoenix Metropolitan Area - 1971[1]

JOB CATEGORIES	TOTAL[2] EMPLOYEES INCLUDING MINORITIES	TOTAL MALE INCLUDING MINORITIES	TOTAL FEMALE INCLUDING MINORITIES	MALE MINORITIES N	O	AI	SS	FEMALE MINORITIES N	O	AI	SS	TOTAL MINORITY
OFFICIALS AND MANAGERS	4204	3831	373	21	10	15	103	4	0	5	9	167
PROFESSIONALS	2130	1965	165	9	13	5	27	1	1	0	15	71
TECHNICIANS	1854	1681	173	16	3	8	72	2	3	0	4	108
SALES WORKERS	3487	2605	882	30	6	5	231	17	5	6	63	363
OFFICE & CLERICAL	6128	1104	5024	32	6	11	74	69	14	43	162	411
CRAFTSMAN (SKILLED)	5670	5346	324	136	22	32	459	3	0	1	13	666
OPERATIVES (SEMI-SKILLED)	6820	5392	1428	477	8	7	853	75	7	11	157	1659
LABORERS (UNSKILLED)	2215	2009	206	239	4	58	323	21	0	2	24	671
SERVICE WORKERS	4068	2304	1764	335	49	39	958	325	36	12	187	1941
TOTAL	36576	26237	10339	1295	121	244	3100	517	66	80	634	6057
						4760				1397		

[1]SOURCE: EEO-1 Forms: Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

[2]Sample consists of 47 companies located in the Phoenix SMSA Including Phoenix, Mesa, Tempe and Scottsdale

N-Negro AI-American Indian
O-Oriental SS-Spanish Surname

Table 29

Indian Employment In Private Industry By Job Categories - Albuquerque, Metropolitan Area 1971[1]

JOB CATEGORIES	TOTAL[2] EMPLOYEES INCLUDING MINORITIES	TOTAL MALE INCLUDING MINORITIES	TOTAL FEMALE INCLUDING MINORITIES	MALE MINORITIES N	O	AI	SS	FEMALE MINORITIES N	O	AI	SS	TOTAL MINOR
OFFICIALS AND MANAGERS	1517	1371	146	3	-	5	79	2	-	-	22	111
PROFESSIONALS	2638	2535	103	13	10	4	80	1	-	-	6	114
TECHNICIANS	1570	1506	64	10	2	8	151	1	-	-	6	178*
SALES WORKERS	668	507	161	2	-	4	140	-	-	5	33	184*
OFFICE & CLERICAL	3001	832	2169	15	-	13	296	30	6	22	488	870*
CRAFTSMAN (SKILLED)	2050	2007	43	14	-	55	592	-	-	3	9	673*
OPERATIVES (SEMI-SKILLED)	1569	1372	197	43	-	76	733	-	4	100	67	1023*
LABORERS (UNSKILLED)	1150	926	224	40	3	80	585	1	3	89	104	905*
SERVICE WORKERS	377	323	54	17	-	7	158	4	-	-	28	214*
TOTAL	14540	11379	3161	157	15	252	2814	39	13	219	763	4272
						3238				1034		

1 Source: EEO-1 Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

2 Sampl consists of 27 companies located in the Albuquerque Metropolitan Area-

FOOTNOTES

FOOTNOTES

1/ See U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Staff Report, "Socio-Economic Profile of American Indians, November, 1972.

2/ Employment Security Commission of Arizona, Navajo Manpower Survey, Arizona State Employment Service (1969) p.6.

3/ See "Socio-Economic Profile". op. cit.

4/ Estimates of Resident Indian Population and Labor Force Status; By State and Reservation: March 1972, Bureau of Indian Affairs, September 1972. The labor force reported here includes all persons 16 years and older except those who cannot work because they are attending school, caring for children, or are unable to work by reason of disability, retirement, or age. Unlike national statistics, the BIA includes persons not seeking work, because of the difficulty in estimating this group without expensive surveys. Consequently, by including persons not wanting or seeking work in the labor force, the unemployment rate would be higher than it would be if a standard household survey were undertaken.

5/ Ibid.

6/ Ibid.

7/ See "Socio-Economic Profile". op. cit.

8/ No accurate data exists which would indicate the overall occupation breakdown of Indians living on reservations. Data for specific reservations, however, are available and where pertinent are used in this report. It should be emphasized that the occupational breakdown is valid only for the reservation in question.

9/ Benjamin J. Taylor, Dennis J. O'Connor, et al., Indian Manpower Resources in the Southwest: A Pilot Study, Bureau of Business and Economic Research, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, 1969.

10/ Navajo Manpower Survey, p.26.

11/ Ibid.

12/ Benjamin J. Taylor, et al., op. cit.

13/ Minority Group Employment in the Federal Government: Nov. 30, 1971. Prepared by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, SM 70-71B. Table 3-32a, p.428-9 and Table 3-4a, p.372-3.

14/ Ibid.

15/ Ibid.

16/ F. Browning Pipestem, Indian Preference: A Preference to Conduct Self-Government, p.8. (Not dated)

17/ Ibid.

18/ The Indian Health Service is a component of the U.S. Public Health Service, a division of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The IHS is not an integral part of the BIA. Essentially, the IHS has the responsibility for providing comprehensive health service to American Indians and Alaska Natives.

19/ F. Browning Pipestem, p.11.

20/ As cited in 116 Congressional Record 10371 - Section 14, December 14, 1970.

21/ Ibid.

22/ Minority Group Employment in the Federal Government: Nov. 30, 1971.

23/ A Report to the Governor by the New Mexico State Personnel Board, Table 7, p.17.

24/ See "Socio-Economic Profile". op.cit.

25/ Racial-Ethnic Survey: Pupils and Employees, Arizona Department of Education, Division of Equal Education Opportunities, Spring, 1972. p.v.

26/ Elementary and Secondary Public School Survey, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, (Fall, 1968).

27/ According to the 1970 Census, Indians constituted 1.6 percent of the population in Bernalillo County, 53.9 percent of the population in McKinley County, 10.3 percent of the total population in Rio Arriba County, 34.2 percent of the population in Sandoval County, 30.9 percent of the population in San Juan County, and 13.2 percent of the population in Valencia County.

28/ 1970 Equal Employment Opportunity - 1 Report Summary By State - 466 Units - New Mexico, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Wash. D.C., 1970. (mimeo)

29/ 1970, EEO - 1 Report Summary By State - 982 Units - Arizona, EEOC, Wash. D.C., 1970. (mimeo)

30/ This survey involved the aggregation of employment data from 47 major companies located in the Phoenix metropolitan area. The primary source of this data were EEO-1 Reports provided by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

31/ This survey involved the aggregation of data from 27 separate companies located in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The primary source of data were EEO-1 Reports.

*This staff paper was prepared by Ernest Gerlach, Research Analyst, Southwestern Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, San Antonio, Texas.

GPO 941-688